



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines


Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>





ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
 MDCCCXX
 CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

Erbert C. Smyth

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10.

HISTORY
OF THE
PLANTING AND TRAINING
OF
THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH
BY THE APOSTLES.

BY
DR. AUGUSTUS NEANDER.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN

By J. E. RYLAND.

**TRANSLATION REVISED AND CORRECTED ACCORDING TO THE
FOURTH GERMAN EDITION,**

By E. G. ROBINSON, D.D.,
PROFESSOR IN THE ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

NEW YORK:
PUBLISHED BY SHELDON & CO., 335 BROADWAY.
BOSTON: GOULD & LINCOLN.


1865.

BS
2410
N4
1865
Cop. 2

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1864, by

SHELDON & CO.,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District
of New York.



Electrotyped by SMITH & McDUGAL, 83 & 84 Beekman-street.

Printed by C. S. WATROOTT & Co., 79 John-street.

P R E F A C E

TO THE

A M E R I C A N E D I T I O N.

MR. RYLAND'S translation of this work was made from the third edition of the original, and was first published in 1841. In 1847, appeared the fourth edition of the original, carefully revised, and containing important additions and modifications in the History itself, besides notices of all the criticisms of any value that had been made, during the six years preceding, on the third edition. In 1851, the most important of the changes found in this fourth edition were embodied by Mr. Ryland under the title of "Additions and Corrections," and appended to his translation. To say nothing of the inconvenience and awkwardness of such an arrangement, there remained, necessarily, a large number of alterations, both in the notes and in the text, of which no notice could be taken without a thorough revision of the translation itself. To make such a revision has been the attempt of the editor in the present edition. And it may not be amiss to say, that, with all the merits of Mr. Ryland as a translator—which are not few nor unacknowledged by those acquainted with his labors—there yet remained in his version of this History, not only occasional misapprehensions of meaning, but obscurities too numerous and too annoying to be perpetuated in a book which so large a circle of readers were desirous of profiting by.

It may, perhaps, be superfluous to add, at this late day, that no work of Neander exhibits more conspicuously his best characteristics as a fervid Christian theologian and a sagacious and critical historian, than his "Planting and Training of the Christian

Church.” The work belongs to a department of theological literature of which the venerated author was the virtual creator. It opened a field of inquiry which has since been diligently cultivated, but on which no one has surpassed or even equalled, in skill and success, its first occupant.

It is believed that the volume, as it now stands, will be intelligible to all readers who are interested in the subjects of which it treats. Its quotations from other languages have all been rendered into English, both in the text and in the notes, so that no reader need longer be disturbed by them. The numerous references to the author’s “Church History” and “Life of Christ,” have been made to conform to the American translations and well-known editions of these works.

E. G. ROBINSON.

ROCHESTER, *Sept.* 27, 1864.

DEDICATION OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND DR. F. EHRENBURG,

ROYAL CHAPLAIN, MEMBER OF THE SUPREME CONSISTORY, ETC., ETC.

MY DEEPLY REVERED AND VERY DEAR FRIEND—

I trust you will receive this work, with all its defects, as the offering of a sincere heart; as a small token of my cordial veneration and love, and of that sincere gratitude which I have long felt impelled to express for the edification I have derived from your discourses. May a gracious God long allow you to labor and shine among us for the welfare of his Church, with that holy energy which He has bestowed upon you, with the spirit of Christian wisdom and freedom—the spirit of true freedom, exalted above all the strife of human parties—which the Son of God alone bestows, and which is especially requisite for the guidance of the Church in our times, agitated and distracted as they are by so many conflicts! This is the warmest wish of one who, with all his heart, calls himself yours.

Thus I wrote on the 22d of May, 1832; and after six years I again repeat, with all my heart, the words expressive of dedication, of gratitude, and of devout wishes to the Giver of all perfect gifts. Since that portion of time (not unimportant in our agitated age) has passed away, I have to thank you, dear and inmosty-revered man, for many important words of edification and instruction which I have received from your lips in public, as well as for the precious gift* which has often administered refreshment to myself and others. Yes, with all my heart I agree with those beautiful sentiments which form the soul of your discourses, and bind me with such force to your person. God grant that we may ever humbly and faithfully hold fast the truth which does not seek for reconciliation amidst contrarieties, but is itself unsought the right mean! God grant (what is far above all theological disputations) that the highest aim of our labors may be to produce the image of Christ in the souls of men—that to our latest breath we may keep this object in view without wavering, fast bound to one another in true love, each one in his own sphere, unmoved by the vicissitudes of opinion and the collisions of party!

Let me add as a subordinate wish, that you would soon favor us with a volume of discourses, to testify of this “one thing that is needful.”

A. NEANDER.

BERLIN, 30th May, 1838.

It gives me very special satisfaction, dearest and most honored friend, to be able to re-dedicate, and, with renewed wishes and expression of thanks, to offer again to you, after you have reached your seventieth year, this book in its present new form.

A. NEANDER.

BERLIN, April 7, 1847.

* Alluding probably to a volume of Sermons already published.—T_r.

DEDICATION OF THE SECOND VOLUME.

TO MY DEAR AND HONORED COLLEAGUE AND FRIEND, THE

REV. DR. NITZSCH,

ROYAL MEMBER OF THE CONSISTORIAL COURT, AND PROFESSOR IN THE FREDERICK WILLIAM UNIVERSITY
OF BERLIN.

It was my purpose, when issuing the last volume of the new edition of my Church History, to greet you from afar with a hearty word or two, and to express to you the satisfaction I felt that we were to be able to call you ours; that, at a period so difficult for those who have to represent higher interests—a period fitted to remind every one so forcibly of his need of aid—we were to win in you so noble and valuable a supplement to our Faculty; but I relinquished the purpose I then had, because, to me at least, there had come no certain knowledge that my hope was to be fulfilled. So I will now express what I then had in mind, as this is the first opportunity I have had for saying a word publicly. I speak only in fulfilment of my original purpose. Accept, then, what I offer out of a true, frank heart. With differing endowments and diversified gifts, serve we the one Lord, who assigns to each his position and uses as He will. We are in harmony in the one great cause for which our science shall serve only as an organ. We are agreed in the conviction that in this great crisis, amid the pangs of this transition period, all depends on our being decided for the one thing needful, not compromising and parleying with the profane spirit of this world, while yet we allow freedom in those various stages of development which only a higher wisdom knows how to conduct to the one goal of the better future, and while, in the spirit of love and in the consciousness of our own defects, we quench not the glimmering wick. Of this conviction you have already testified in the transactions of the General Synod on the Creed question. Now may the Spirit of God ever bind us more closely to one another, and purify us of every thing which could divide us; may He bless our coöperation in the one great work and for the one great end. May He long preserve you to our University, and through you, as our pastor, so work that our University shall become more and more *Christian*, shall be transformed into a *workshop of the Holy Spirit*, where science is elaborated for divine ends; especially that that may be more and more awaked and diffused which you in your last sermon (for which, as well as for other printed and spoken discourses, I thank you) have so appropriately set forth—the opposite of the contracted understanding of our time—the *understanding of the heart*, without which nothing of divine things can be understood by any one.

Cordially yours,

A. NEANDER.

BERLIN, July 19, 1847.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

It was certainly my intention to have allowed my representation of the Christian religion and Church in the apostolic age to follow the completion of the whole of my Church History, or at least of the greater part of it; but the wishes and entreaties of many persons, expressed both in writing and by word of mouth, have prevailed upon me to alter my plan. Those, too, who took an interest in my mode of conceiving the development of Christianity, were justified in demanding an account of the manner in which I conceived the origin of this process, on which the opinions of men are so much divided through the conflicting influences of the various theological tendencies in this critical period of our German Evangelical Church; and perhaps, if it please God, a thoroughly-matured and candidly-expressed conviction on the subjects here discussed, may furnish many a one who is engaged in seeking, with a connecting link for the comprehension of his own views, even if this representation, though the result of protracted and earnest inquiry, should contain no new disclosures.

As for my relation to all who hold the conviction, that faith in Jesus, the Saviour of sinful humanity, as it has shown itself since the first founding of the Christian Church to be the fountain of divine life, will prove itself the same to the end of time, and that from this faith a new creation will arise in the Christian Church and in our part of the world, which has been preparing amidst the storms of spring—to all such persons I hope to be bound by the bond of Christian fellowship, the bond of “*the true Catholic spirit*,” as it is termed by an excellent English theologian of the seventeenth

century.* But I can not agree with the conviction of those among them who think that this new creation will be only a repetition of what took place in the sixteenth or seventeenth century, and that the whole dogmatic system, and the entire mode of contemplating divine and human things,† must return as it then existed.

On this point, I assent with my whole soul to what my deeply revered and beloved friend, Steudel, lately expressed, so deserving of consideration in our times, and especially to be commended to the attention of our young theologians.‡ He admirably remarks: "But exactly this, and only this, is the preëminence of the one truth, that it maintains its triumphant worth under all changes of form;" and Niebuhr detected, in the eagerness to restore the old, an eagerness for novelty: "When the novelty of the thing is worn away by use, we are prone to return to the old, which then becomes new again, and thus the ball is thrown backwards and forwards."§

* We meet with a beautiful specimen of such a spirit in what has been admirably said by a respected theologian of the Society of Friends, Joseph John Gurney: "It can scarcely be denied, that in that variety of administration through which the saving principles of religion are for the present permitted to pass, *there is much of a real adaptation to a corresponding variety of mental condition.* Well, therefore, may we bow with thankfulness before that infinite and unsearchable Being who, in all our weakness, follows us with His love, and through the diversified mediums of religion to which the several classes of *true* Christians are respectively accustomed, is still pleased to reveal to them all *the same* crucified Redeemer, and to direct their footsteps into one path of obedience, holiness, and peace." See *Observations on the distinguishing Views and Practices of the Society of Friends*, by Joseph John Gurney, ed. vii., London, 1834. Words fit to shame theologians who are burning with zeal for the letter and forms, as if on these depended the essence of religion, whose life and spirit are rooted in facts.

† Well might the noble words of Luther be applied to those who cling to the old rotten posts of a scaffolding raised by human hands, as if they were needed for the divine building: "When at a window I have gazed on the stars of heaven, and the whole beautiful vault of heaven, and saw no pillars on which the Builder had set such a vault; yet the heavens fell not in; and that vault still stands firm. Now there are simple folk who look about for such pillars, and would fain grasp and feel them. But since they can not do this, they quake and tremble, as if the heavens would certainly fall in, and for no other reason than because they can not grasp and see the pillars; if they could but lay hold of them, then the heavens (they think) would stand firm enough."

‡ In the *Tübingen Zeitschrift für Theologie*, 1832, part i., p. 33. Blessed be the memory of this beloved man, who left this world a few months ago, and is no longer to be seen in the holy band of combatants for that evangelical truth which was the aim, the centre, and the soul of his whole life, and the firm anchor of his hope in death, when he proved himself to be one of those faithful teachers of whom it may be said—"whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation."

§ One of the many golden sentences of this great man in his letters, of which we would recommend the second volume especially to all young theologians.

In truth, whatever is connected with the peculiarities of the forms of human cultivation, as these change, goes the way of all flesh; but the Word of God, which is destined by a perpetual youthfulness of power to make all things new, abides forever. Thus the difference existing between these persons and myself, will certainly show itself in our conception of many important points in this department of history; but, in my judgment, these differences are only scientific, and ought not to disturb that fellowship which is above all science. But I can also transport myself to the position of those to whom these objects must appear in a different light; for the rise of such differences is in this critical period unavoidable, and far better than the previous indifference and lifeless uniformity. And even in zeal for a definite form, I know how to esteem and to love a zeal for the essence which lies at the bottom,* and I can never have anything in common with those who will not do justice to such zeal, or, instead of treating it with the respect that is always due to zeal and affection for what is holy, with Jesuitical craft aim at rendering others suspected, by imputing to them sinister motives and designs.

A. NEANDER.

BERLIN, 29th May, 1832.

* Provided it be the true zeal of simplicity, which accompanies humility, and where sagacity does not predominate over simplicity; but by no means that zeal which, in coupling itself with the modern coxcomby of a super-refined education, endeavors to season subjects with it to which it is least adapted, in order to render them palatable to the vitiated tastes that loathes a simple diet; and thus proves its own unsoundness. A caricature jumble of the most contradictory elements, at which every sound feeling must revolt.

PREFACE TO THE FOURTH EDITION.

I repeat here what I said in the preface to the third edition of this work: we adhere to the *theologia pectoris*, which is also the true theology of the spirit—the German Theology, as Luther called it. It was the reaction of such a theology from the aridity of the later period of scholasticism, which produced the Reformation; and it is only from the depths of the heart that any genuine German regeneration of theology can proceed. I shall not cease, therefore, to protest against that one-sided intellectualism which is destructive not only to heart but to mind also, since these can be healthfully, only when harmoniously, developed—against that ever-spreading fanaticism of the intellect which threatens to destroy all deep-rooted life, all high aspiration, all that free flight of the spirit which keeps men ever young, and to convert man, from whose true nature a desire for the supernatural and for that beyond the present life, is inseparable, into a merely intelligent, very sagacious animal. To this protest belong also many things which I have felt constrained to say in the notes to this new edition, against various tendencies of the present time.

In such points of controversy as come under notice in the present edition, we are concerned for the most part only with single questions of criticism. But the profounder observer will perceive that the principles underlying these are closely connected with those more general questions which are agitating science and life at this critical period of time. Single inquiries, it is true, must be pursued independently, and in accordance with their own scientific laws; but this does not stand in the way of our pointing out their connection with questions of a more general, fundamental nature; for it is this connection, which, between those standing at opposite

points of view, renders a mutual understanding difficult, if not impossible.

The scientific, prophetic glance of a Melancthon led him, some centuries ago, to point out that extreme limit to which the opposition between the supernatural and natural principles would lead, when he, in a letter to Œcolampadius, of the 12th of January, 1530, writes: "Si rationem spectes, nihilo magis cum carnis judicio reliqua fidei dogmata de divinitate Christi, de resurrectione, adde et, quod caput est, de immortalitate animi, *περὶ προνοίας* conveniunt, quam hic articulus *περὶ εὐχαριστίας*." Hidden antagonisms are becoming more and more widely separated, more and more clearly understood, and more and more sharply opposed to each other; and thus this broadest and deepest reaching of questions is to be brought by history—that is, not by the universal spirit in history, as the language of the day is, but by the Spirit of God, to whom the universal spirit, nolens volens, must do homage—to its decision, a decision which will introduce a new period in Church History.

But I must also, with equal persistency, protest against the theological tendency so beautifully and so forcibly characterized by the sainted Schleiermacher in his Essay on the Symbolic Books; a tendency, he says, "which would blot out a well-known and important period of time, and wiping off, as with a sponge, the characters which that period has written upon our historical tablet, would, far more easily than the old lines of a *codex rescriptus* can be restored, reproduce the writings of the seventeenth century and account them as our own." It is a tendency which, arresting the progress of development in theology, would, in impatient haste, prematurely seize the goal; although it exhibits a praise-worthy elevation of spirit as regards that which is lifted above the change of days, that in which there is no place for the trite newspaper categories, "progress and regress." My own soul responds to what my dear friend, Julius Müller, has said against this, as against other theological tendencies, in his excellent article on the First General Synod, an essay of more than mere transient and accidental value. With this tendency, also, many things which I have had to say in this new edition, in defence of my view of history and criticism, will come in conflict. I cheerfully submit to the charge of incon-

sistency and lack of decision, from advocates of both these views which I have been constrained to oppose.

The second volume, which is to be immediately put to press, will soon appear. Then I will look toward the time which will permit me, if the gracious God continue to me life, health, and strength, to give to the public the continuation of my Church History—the history of the time preparatory to the Reformation—a work to which my studies and labors, during the preparation of this, have ever been directed.

The excellent new map, for which we are indebted to the distinguished Dr. Kiepert, will doubtless be found very useful and welcome to the readers of this book. By the care of my esteemed publisher, it can be obtained separately, and may thus be of wider service to students.

In conclusion, I thank my dear young friend, Cand. Schneider, from Silesia—who knows how to combine so well different branches of activity—for the fidelity, care, and skill with which he has read the proof of this book, verified its citations, and arranged its table of contents.

A. NEANDER.

BERLIN, April 7, 1847.

C O N T E N T S .

INTRODUCTION.

	PAGES
Sources of this History, the Epistles and the Acts.....	1
General evidence of the credibility of the Acts.	1-4

B O O K I.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH IN PALESTINE PREVIOUS TO ITS INTRODUCTION AMONG HEATHEN NATIONS.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH ON ITS FIRST APPEARANCE AS A DISTINCT RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY.

The personal Christ the basis of the Church—The Pentecostal miracle the beginning of the Apostolic Church.....	5-7
Anxious waiting for the feast of Pentecost by the disciples.....	7-8
The outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost and the phenomena accompanying it.....	8-11
The gift of tongues not a supernatural knowledge of foreign languages, but the new language of the new spirit that animated the disciples.....	12-17
An ideal element infused into the historical	18
Peter's discourse and its effects—His call to repentance, faith, and baptism.....	18-20

CHAPTER II.

THE FIRST FORM OF THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY, AND THE FIRST GERM OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

The formation of a community—One article of faith—Baptism into Jesus as the Messiah—Probably only one baptismal formula—Imperfect knowledge and mixed character of the first converts.....	20-22
The first form of the Christian community and worship—The Agapæ	22-23
Community of goods—Influence of Christianity on social relations—Orders of monkhood—The St. Simonians.....	23-25
The case of Ananias and Sapphira.....	25-26
Adherence to the Temple-worship.....	27-28
The institution of Deacons.....	29-33

	PAGES
The institution of Presbyters—Originally for the purpose of government rather than of instruction.....	33-34
Means of instruction—Teachers; <i>διδασκαλία, προφητεία, παράκλησις</i>	35-36
Gradual transition from Judaism to Christianity.....	36-37

CHAPTER III.

THE OUTWARD CONDITION OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH; PERSECUTIONS AND THEIR CONSEQUENCES.

The Church at first favored by the Pharisees and opposed by the Sadducees....	38
The cure of the impotent man—Peter and John brought before the Sanhedrim— The increase of believers—Peter's address—Gamaliel.....	38-46
Christianity in direct conflict with Pharisaism—Stephen the forerunner of Paul— His views of Christianity in opposition to the permanence of the Mosaic ritual—His discourse before the Sanhedrim—His martyrdom, and its effects...	46-57

BOOK II.

THE FIRST SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY FROM THE CHURCH AT JERUSALEM TO OTHER PARTS, AND ESPECIALLY AMONG HEATHEN NATIONS.

Samaria—Its religious state—The Goetæ—Simon Magus—Philip's preaching and miracles in Samaria—Simon's baptism.....	58-60
The sending of Peter and John to Samaria—Miraculous manifestations of the Spirit.....	61-63
A later Simon—Simonians.....	63-64
Philip's further missionary labors.....	64-65
Examination of objections to the credibility of the Acts on the ground of Peter's vacillation at Antioch at a later day.....	66-68
Formation of Gentile Churches—Enlarged views of the Apostles produced by internal revelation and outward events.....	68-69
Peter's labors at Lydda and Joppa—Cornelius the Centurion—A proselyte of the Gate—His prayers and fasting—Vision of an Angel—Peter's vision—His address to Cornelius—The gift of the Holy Spirit bestowed on the Gentile converts.....	69-77

BOOK III.

THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY, AND FOUNDING OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH AMONG THE GENTILES BY THE INSTRUMENTALITY OF THE APOSTLE PAUL.

CHAPTER I.

PAUL'S PREPARATION AND CALL TO BE THE APOSTLE OF THE GENTILES.

The divine wisdom in Paul's preparation for his office.....	78-79
Paul the representative of the Protestant principle among the Apostles.....	79

CONTENTS.

xv

	PAGES
His birthplace, parentage, and education.....	80-82
His strictness and depth of experience in legal piety—Resemblance to Augustine and Luther—Zeal for Judaism—Journey to Damascus.....	82-84
His miraculous conversion—Unsatisfactory explanation on natural principles—Or considered as merely internal—A real appearance of the risen Saviour—Its effects.....	85-92
Paul preaches the Gospel at Damascus—Goes into Arabia—Return to Damascus—and flight—Visit to Jerusalem and its object.....	92-97
Early development of his special type of doctrine—What he means by “revelation” as the source of his religious knowledge (<i>αποκαλύπτειν</i> and <i>φανεροῦν</i>)—His use of <i>Memoirs of Christ</i>	97-103
His return to Tarsus and labors in Cilicia.....	103

CHAPTER II.

THE CHURCH AT ANTIOCH THE GENTILE MOTHER-CHURCH, AND ITS RELATION TO THE JEWISH MOTHER-CHURCH.

Gentile Christians at Antioch—Barnabas at Antioch—invites Paul thither—The name <i>Christians</i> first given to believers—Contributions from the Church at Jerusalem—Contributions from the Church at Antioch to the Church at Jerusalem—Persecution by Herod Agrippa.....	104-106
Paul's visit to Jerusalem—Whether the same as that mentioned in Gal. ii. 1.—Barnabas and Paul sent from Antioch to preach among the Gentiles.....	107-111

CHAPTER III.

THE PROPAGATION OF CHRISTIANITY FROM ANTIOCH BY PAUL AND BARNABAS.

Their visit with Mark to Cyprus—Conversion of the Proconsul Sergius Paulus—The Goēs Barjesus.....	111-113
Their stay at Antioch in Pisidia—Bitterness of the Jews—Persecutions.....	113-115
Iconium—Lystra—Cure of the lame man—The Apostles supposed to be Zeus and Hermes—The popular tumult—Their return to Antioch.....	116-119

CHAPTER IV.

CONTROVERSY BETWEEN THE JEWISH AND GENTILE CHRISTIANS, AND ITS SETTLEMENT—THE INDEPENDENT DEVELOPMENT OF THE GEN- TILE CHURCH.

Dispute between the Jewish and Gentile Christians respecting Circumcision—Mission of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem—Paul's private conferences with the Apostles—His Apostleship acknowledged—His controversy with the Jewish believers, and opposition to the circumcision of Titus.....	119-124
<i>The Apostolic Convention</i> .—Peter's address—Barnabas and Paul give an account of their success among the Gentiles—Proposal of James—The moderation and conciliatory spirit of Paul and James—Epistle to the Gentile Christians in Syria and Cilicia—Return of Paul and Barnabas to Antioch—The important results of this Convention.	125-134

CHAPTER V.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH, AND THE ECCLESIASTICAL USAGES
OF THE GENTILE CHRISTIANS.

	PAGES
The peculiar nature of the Christian community—all Christians Priests—equally related to Christ—and in a relation of fraternal equality to one another.....	134-136
The influence of the Holy Spirit on the varieties of mental character and natural endowments—The idea of Charisms—The gifts of <i>δυνάμεις, σημεῖα, τέρατα</i> ...	136-138
1. Charisms or gifts for the ministry of the Word, "teaching," "prophesying," "speaking with tongues," "interpretation of tongues," "trying of spirits," "word of knowledge," and "word of wisdom".....	136-144
2. Charisms relating to other kinds of outward activity—these distinguished as charisms for government and the charism of faith (miraculous power).....	144-146
Charisms relating to the government of the Church, <i>πρεσβύτεροι, ἐπίσκοποι</i> —Elders or Presbyters and Overseers or Bishops, originally the same—Exclusion of females from the office of public teaching.....	147-150
Originally three orders of teachers—Apostles, Evangelists, Teachers—Relation of the last to Elders and Overseers.....	150-154
The office of Deaconesses.....	154-155
Ordination—Election to offices.....	156
3. The Christian Worship—Independence of the Mosaic Ritual—Hence no distinction of days—No Christian feasts mentioned by Paul.....	156-158
The Christian Sabbath—Its special reference to the Resurrection of Christ—No yearly commemoration of the Resurrection.....	158-160
Baptism—The Formula—Symbolical meaning of the act of submersion and emersion—Infant Baptism probably not of apostolic origin—Substitutionary Baptism—The influence of the parental relation on the offspring of Christians	160-165
The Lord's Supper.....	165
Advantages and disadvantages of the Gentile Converts—Preparation of mankind for a reception of the Gospel—by a sense of guilt and unhappiness—Its direct contrariety to Heathenism—Dangers from the corruption of Morals—and from philosophical speculations.....	165-167

CHAPTER VI.

SECOND MISSIONARY JOURNEY OF THE APOSTLE PAUL.

The separation of Paul and Barnabas on account of Mark—Barnabas with Mark visits Cyprus—Paul and Silas pass through Syria to Cilicia and Pisidia—Meet with Timothy who is circumcised and becomes a companion of Paul.....	167-170
Paul visits Phrygia—Churches there founded by Epaphras and others.....	170
Paul in Galatia—Called supernaturally to Macedonia.....	170-173
Paul at Philippi—Baptism of Lydia—Persecution—Conversion of the Philippian Gaoler.....	173-177
Paul at Thessalonica—Addresses both Jews and Gentiles—Gains a livelihood by tent-making—His expectations of the near approach of the second coming of Christ—Fanatical opposition of the Jews—Proceeds to Berea.....	178-182
Paul at Athens—The religious character of the Athenians—Paul disputes with the Philosophers—The relation of the Stoics and the Epicureans to Christianity.....	182-184

	PAGES
Paul's discourse—His appeal to the religious principle implanted in human nature—The Altar to an unknown God—Polytheism—The one living God—Announcement of a Redeemer—The effect of his discourse—Dionysius the Areopagite	184-190
Timothy returning from Macedonia sent again to Thessalonica	190-191
Paul at Corinth—Two chief obstacles to the reception of the Gospel—fondness for speculation—and for sensual indulgences—Meets with Aquila and Priscilla—The Church formed principally of Gentile converts—The Proconsul Gallio—Paul's labors in Achaia	191-196
Thessalonica—Information of the state of the Church brought by Timothy— <i>The First Epistle to the Thessalonians</i> —Enthusiastic tendencies—A forged epistle— <i>The Second Epistle to the Thessalonians</i> —The signs preceding the second coming of Christ—Marks of a genuine epistle	196-201

CHAPTER VII.

THE APOSTLE PAUL'S JOURNEY TO ANTIOCH, AND HIS RENEWED MISSIONARY LABORS AMONG THE HEATHEN.

Paul's journey to Jerusalem—His vow and offering in the Temple	202-203
Paul at Antioch—His meeting with Barnabas and Peter—His reprimand of Peter—Revival of the controversy between the Jewish and Gentile Christians	203-207
Paul visits Phrygia and Galatia	207-208
Paul at Ephesus—His labors first in the synagogue—Then among the Gentiles—the Jewish Goetæ—The disciples of John the Baptist rebaptized—Receipt of intelligence from the churches and effect on him	208-212
State of the Galatian Churches—Paul's <i>Epistle to the Galatians</i> written by his own hand—Asserts his independent apostleship—States the relation of Christianity to Judaism and Heathenism—Warns them against seeking for justification by the law—Date of this epistle	212-217
State of the Church at Corinth—Causes of its disorders; superficial conversion, general immorality, divisions occasioned by false teachers	218-219
Parties in the Corinthian Church—The Petrine—The Pauline—That of Apollos—That of Christ	219-230
Disputes in the Corinthian Church—Meat offered in sacrifice to idols—Marriage and celibacy—Litigation in heathen courts of justice—Irregularities at the celebration of the Agapæ—Overvaluation of extraordinary gifts—Opposition to the doctrine of the resurrection	230-239
Where and by what means Paul received accounts of the disturbances at Corinth—His second visit to Corinth—His lost <i>Epistle to the Corinthians</i>	239-242
<i>The First Epistle to the Corinthians</i> —Occasioned by certain questions proposed by the Church relative to the epistle not now extant—Its contents—On parties—On meat offered to idols—On marriage and celibacy—On slavery—Its date	243-249
Paul's plans for his future labors—Mission of Timothy to Macedonia and Achaia—Return of Timothy—Titus sent to Corinth—Popular commotion at Ephesus against Paul—Demetrius—Alexander—The Asiarchs—Paul leaves Ephesus	249-256
Paul in Macedonia—Titus brings information respecting the Church at Corinth— <i>The Second Epistle to the Corinthians</i>	257-260
Paul after spending the summer and autumn in Macedonia, and probably visiting Illyria, spends the winter in Achaia—His intention of visiting Rome—His	

	PAGES
Epistle to the Romans—sent by the deaconess Phœbe—State of the Church at Rome—Contents of the epistle.....	261-271
Paul's great collection for Jerusalem for the removal of Jewish prejudices against himself and the Gentile Christians.....	272-274

CHAPTER VIII.

THE FIFTH AND LAST JOURNEY OF PAUL TO JERUSALEM—ITS IMMEDIATE CONSEQUENCES—HIS IMPRISONMENT IN PALESTINE.

Paul at Philippi—Meets the overseers of the Ephesian Church at Miletus—His farewell address.....	274-279
Paul warned of approaching danger at Cæsarea.....	279
Paul at Jerusalem—His conference with James and the elders of the Church—His Nazarite's vow—The rage of the Jews—His rescue by the Roman tribune—His appearance before the Sanhedrim.....	279-284
Paul's imprisonment at Cæsarea—His appearance before Felix—Appeals to Cæsar—Address to King Agrippa—Sent to Rome.....	285-287
Paul at Rome—His condition and labors there	287-289

CHAPTER IX.

PAUL DURING HIS FIRST CONFINEMENT AT ROME, AND THE DEVELOPMENT DURING THAT PERIOD OF THE CHURCHES FOUNDED BY HIM.

Paul's relation to the Roman State—To the Church at Rome—And to other Churches—His care of the Asiatic Churches—Date of the Epistles to the Colossians, Ephesians, and Philemon—Epaphras his fellow-prisoner.....	290-293
False teachers at Colossæ—Peculiarities of the party—The germ of Judaizing Gnosticism—Allied to the sect of Cerinthus—Paul's <i>Epistle to the Colossians</i>	294-302
Paul's <i>Epistle to the Ephesians</i> —Sent by Tychicus—a general Epistle to the Churches in Lesser Asia.....	302-305
Paul's <i>Epistle to the Philippians</i>	305

CHAPTER X.

PAUL'S LABORS AFTER HIS RELEASE FROM HIS FIRST CONFINEMENT AT ROME, TO HIS MARTYRDOM.

Evidence of Paul's release from his first confinement at Rome—Testimony of Clemens of Rome—The <i>Second Epistle to Timothy</i> —Causes of the Neronian persecution	306-311
Paul's labors after his release—In Ephesus—In Macedonia—The <i>First Epistle to Timothy</i> —Paul in Crete—The <i>Epistle to Titus</i> —Prospective visit to Nicopolis.	311-317
Paul in Spain—His Second imprisonment—His martyrdom and state of mind in view of it—Release of Timothy.....	317-320

BOOK IV.

A REVIEW OF THE LABORS OF JAMES AND PETER DURING THE PERIOD DESCRIBED IN BOOK THIRD.

CHAPTER I.

JAMES.

	PAGES
James, the brother of the Lord, and Paul, mark the two extremes in the development of Christianity from Judaism,.....	321-324
Whether James was a brother or only a near relation of the Lord, and identical with the Apostle? Dr. Schneckenburger's hypothesis that there was only one James, examined,.....	321-325
James distinguished by the strictness of his life; hence called <i>The Just</i> —The testimony of Hegesippus,.....	325-327
His epistle important for illustrating the state of the Jewish-Christian churches,	327
Reasons for believing that it was not written with a reference to Paul's doctrinal views,.....	328-338
The epistle addressed to churches consisting entirely or chiefly of Jewish believers, mostly poor,.....	333-335
The Christian doctrines imperfectly developed in it—Its importance in connexion with the other writings in the New Testament,.....	336
The martyrdom of James.....	337-338

CHAPTER II.

THE APOSTLE PETER.

He occupied a middle position between Paul and James,.....	338
His parentage—Natural character—Call to the apostleship,.....	338-341
His labors in propagating the Gospel,.....	341-343
His First Epistle.....	343-347
Probable spuriousness of the Second Epistle.....	347-348
Traditions respecting Peter's martyrdom at Rome.....	348-353

BOOK V.

THE APOSTLE JOHN AND HIS MINISTRY AS THE CLOSING POINT OF THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

His education—Maternal influence—Early piety—General character—Contemplative yet ardent—His piety moulded by personal intercourse with the Saviour,.....	354-357
His labors and conflicts among the churches in Lesser Asia,.....	357-359
Errors prevalent in these churches, practical and theoretical—Especially the Judaizing—The Antinomian, the anti-Judaizing Gnostic, and the Cerinthian,	360-364
Tradition of John's banishment to Patmos—Authorship of the Apocalypse,....	364-367

	PAGES
John's writings—Their general character—His Gospel.....	368–371
His First Epistle.....	371–375
His Second Epistle—Injunctions respecting intercourse with false teachers,....	375, 376
His Third Epistle—Diotrephes,.....	376, 377
Traditions respecting John's labors preserved by Clemens Alexandrinus and Jerome—The close of the Apostolic Age,	377–379

BOOK VI.

THE APOSTOLIC DOCTRINE.

The living unity of the doctrine of Christ combined with a variety in the forms of its representation—Three leading varieties—The Pauline, the Jacobean (with the intermediate Petrine), and the Johannean,.....	380
--	-----

CHAPTER I.

THE PAULINE DOCTRINE.

Regard must be had to Paul's peculiarities of mind, education, sphere of labor, and sources of Christian knowledge,.....	381
1. The connexion and contrast of Paul's earlier and later views contained in the ideas of <i>δικαιοσύνη</i> and <i>νόμος</i> , which form the central point of his doctrine,	382
The <i>δικαιοσύνη</i> of his earlier position depended on the observance of the Mosaic law (<i>νομική</i>)—The Christian <i>δικαιοσύνη</i> and <i>ζωή</i> correlative ideas,.....	382
The fundamental principle of his later or Christian views—No righteousness by the works of the law available before God—No essential distinction between the ritual and moral <i>ἔργα νόμου</i> —The idea of the law as a unity; an outward rule of action, <i>requiring</i> not <i>effecting</i> obedience—Applicable to the universal law of conscience,.....	383
Works the marks of the state of the disposition; but the law can effect no change in the disposition—Hence <i>ἔργα νόμου</i> are set in contrast to <i>ἔργα ἀγαθὰ</i> (Eph. ii. 10),	384
The law not deficient as a <i>standard</i> of duty,.....	385
2. The central-point of the Pauline anthropology—Human nature alienated from the divine life and in opposition to the law.	
a. The principle that opposes the law.	
σὰρξ—σαρκικός—The disunion in human nature not necessary—but voluntary and blameworthy,	385, 386
σαρκικός, equivalent to ψυχικός, in opposition to the <i>θεῖον πνεῦμα</i> , denotes human nature generally in its state of estrangement from the divine life,....	386, 387
b. Origin of sin and death.	
The consciousness of sin and of the need of redemption presupposed as a universal fact; hence the origin of sin seldom adverted to, but the idea of an original state of perfection, and the voluntary fall of the first man, lies at the basis of Paul's doctrine,.....	387, 388

<p>The first man not the representative of human nature generally—The origin of sinful desire from apparent guiltlessness (Rom. vii. 9) not referable to Adam—The natural man preceding the spiritual (1 Cor. xv. 46) implies not sinfulness but subjection to death,.....</p> <p>According to Rom. v. 12, the sinful direction of the will was produced by Adam's voluntary act, from original sinlessness, and continues itself in the whole development of the race,.....</p> <p>Through sin death comes upon all men, not by an essential change in the physical organization of man, but in man's view of death—Death appears not as a step in the development of life, but as a consequence of the withdrawal of the divine life through sin,.....</p> <p>c. Supremacy of the sinful principle in human nature in connexion with an undeniable consciousness of God.</p> <p>The original affinity to God not destroyed but suppressed—The use of the works of creation in awakening the religious sentiment—Religious susceptibility injured by sin—the origin of idolatry—Deterioration of man's moral nature, yet the power of conscience not destroyed.....</p> <p>The trichotomy of human nature (1 Thess. v. 23) <i>πνεῦμα, ψύχη, σῶμα</i>—The <i>ψύχη</i> not the principle of animal life, but the lower and worldly self-consciousness,.....</p> <p>The "inner man,".....</p> <p>d. The state of disunion.</p> <p>Two contending principles in human nature, spirit and flesh—States of bondage, either unconscious, living without law, or conscious, living under the law—Rom. vii. a delineation of both these states, taken from Paul's own experience, but applicable to all mankind,.....</p> <p>3. Preparatives for Redemption—Judaism and Heathenism.</p> <p>a. Judaism—Preparative in two ways—By awakening an anxiety for redemption, and by pointing to the means by which it would be effected—Only one universal purpose of God, who reveals his redeeming grace in its promise and its fulfilment—Faith, one universal condition—The fundamental relation between God and man not altered by the law, which served partly to repress the outbursts of sin, partly to excite the consciousness of sin,.....</p> <p>b. Heathenism.</p> <p>Judaism a progressive revelation, but heathenism only a development of nature—Though idolatry suppressed the original revelation of God in the works of Nature, still the law of conscience remained (of which the Mosaic law was a representative), and with that a sense of the need of redemption—Partial enlightenment and fulfilment of the law among the heathen,.....</p> <p>c. Hindrances and conditions of salvation in both Jews and Heathens.</p> <p>The gross security of heathenism—The legal righteousness of Judaism—The sign-seeking of the Jews, and the wisdom-seeking of the Gentiles—Redemption the object of the whole history of mankind—Attestations to the universal need of redemption in Christ's discourses as recorded in the first three Gospels,.....</p> <p>4. The Work of Redemption.</p> <p>A. Its accomplishment by Christ, both actively and passively,.....</p> <p>a. The life of Christ exhibits the destruction of sin, and the realization of the law in human nature,.....</p>	<p>388, 389</p> <p>390</p> <p>391, 392</p> <p></p> <p>392, 393</p> <p>394, 395</p> <p>395</p> <p></p> <p>395–398</p> <p></p> <p></p> <p>398–401</p> <p></p> <p>401–403</p> <p></p> <p>401–408</p> <p></p> <p></p> <p>408–412</p> <p>408–410</p>
--	---

h. The sufferings of Christ (constantly to be viewed in connexion with his own life),	410-413
B. The results of the work of Christ.	
a. Reconciliation with God.	
The life and sufferings of Christ a revelation of the eternal love of God—Men, once the enemies of God, become through Christ objects of divine love,	412
Possibility of reconciliation as merely subjective—A change in the disposition of man towards God effected by the work of Christ—But even on this supposition the amendment in man is the effect, not the cause of God's love; 2 Cor. v. 20,	412-414
But this view inadequate and untenable—The sense of the wrath of God has an objective basis—A revelation of the divine holiness,	414
The distinction between <i>πάρεσις</i> and <i>ἄφεσις</i> ,	415, 416
The divine holiness revealed in Christ in a twofold manner,	416
b. <i>ἀπολύτρωσις</i> and <i>σωτηρία</i> , freedom from guilt and punishment; in a wider sense as effected objectively by Christ, and realized in individuals in a more limited sense,	417
c. <i>δικαίωσις</i> .	
The Pauline <i>δικαίωσις</i> , like the Jewish, inseparable from a participation in all the privileges of the kingdom of God—but only to be obtained through fellowship with Christ, the only perfect <i>δίκαιος</i> :	
Hence <i>δικαίωσις</i> the induction of a believer in Christ into the relation of a <i>δίκαιος</i> ; <i>δικαιοσύνη</i> the appropriation of Christ's righteousness as the objective ground of faith, as well as the subjective principle of life; hence its necessarily supposed departure from a life of sin, and entrance into the holy life of Christ,	417, 418
5. The Appropriation of Salvation by Faith.	
a. The nature of Faith.	
The reception of divine revelation by an internal determination of the will—In this respect, and not in reference to the object, Abraham was a pattern of the righteousness that is by faith; Rom. iv. 19,	419, 420
Christian faith modified by its object—A twofold reference to Christ as crucified and risen,	420, 421
b. <i>πίστις</i> the peculiarity of the Christian stand-point, in distinction from the Jewish legal.	
The law requires everything which faith already contains; Rom. x. 5, ...	421, 422
The law is in itself a deadly letter—The gospel a life-giving spirit—In the believer, the law is not an object merely of knowledge, but of efficient love, ...	422, 423
The law is so far abrogated for believers, that their <i>δικαιοσύνη</i> and <i>ζῶη</i> are independent of it through faith, from which <i>ἔργα ἁγαθὰ</i> spontaneously proceed,	423
Paul's appeals to the <i>νόμος</i> are only to the outward Mosaic law as an expression of the eternal law of God,	424
Hence the term <i>νόμος</i> denotes in a more general sense what is common to both Judaism and Christianity; in the one to an outward, in the other to an inward law,	424, 425
Under the Jewish Theocracy the service was external, <i>ἐν παλαιότητι γράμματος</i> —Under the Gospel internal, <i>ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος</i> —Its <i>δουλεία</i> identical with <i>νίθεσία</i> ; the worship of the former, <i>σαρκική</i> , of the latter, <i>πνευματική</i> ; in the one it was <i>κατὰ σάρκα</i> , in the other <i>ἐν κυρίῳ</i> ,	425-427

6. The New Life proceeding from Faith.

- a. The transformation of the sinful nature by the Divine; accomplished gradually; the *σὰρξ* opposed not merely by the higher nature of man, but by the Spirit of Christ (*πνεῦμα ἁγίου*), 427, 428

All the mental and bodily powers become organs of grace—The Spirit of Christ pervades all the peculiar talents of individuals; hence charisma, 429, 430

Objective justification as an unchangeable ground of confidence, distinguished from subjective sanctification, which is often an uncertain ground, 430

- b. The principles of the new life—Faith, Love, Hope.

πίστις sometimes denotes the whole extent of Christian ability—*δύναμις τῇ πίστει* relates particularly to the judgment formed by the Christian of outward things—Hence proceeds Christian freedom, which is shown even in submitting to outward restraints—Nothing indifferent, 430–433

Love the natural effect of faith—By the revelation of the love of God in redemption, love to him is continually kindled. 434

Faith and love partly relate to the kingdom of God as present, but they have also a marked relation to the future, for the new life is in a state of constant progression, it longs after the perfect revelation of the children of God, 435–437

Hence hope necessarily belongs to faith and love—Perseverance in the work of faith is the practical side of hope. 437

The knowledge of divine things proceeds from faith—Proceeds from the spiritual life—Depends on the increase of love—Being necessarily defective in the present state, is connected with the hope of perfect intuition, 438, 439

Love the greatest of the three, because it alone abides for ever; 1 Cor. xiii. 13, 439, 440

- c. Special Christian virtues proceeding from Faith, Love, and Hope.

a. *ταπεινοφροσύνη* distinguishes the Christian from the Hebrew view of the world; only partial even on the Jewish stand-point; though its direct relation is to God alone, yet its effects are, opposition to all self-exaltation, and moderation towards others, 441–444

β. *σωφροσύνη*, sober-mindedness in conflict with the world, 2 Tim. i. 7; and in self-estimation, Rom. xii. 3, 444

γ. *σοφία*—The understanding under the influence of faith—Wisdom and prudence, 444, 445

Analogy to the cardinal virtues of heathen philosophers—Love occupies the place of *δικαιοσύνη*, 445, 446

7. The Church and the Sacraments.

A. The Church.

The immediate relation of each individual to Christ of primary importance—Hence the idea of a community founded on the unity of the Holy Spirit in believers, which counterbalances all other differences, Gal. iii. 26, .. 446, 447

The *ἐκκλησία* is the body of Christ—Faith in Christ its foundation—Marks of its unity, Eph. iv. 4, 448

The Old Testament terms applied to Christians; *ἅγιοι* denotes their objective consecration joined with subjective sanctification—*κλητοί* the outward and inward call considered as one—The idea and the appearance in general not separated by Paul, 448, 449

But in particular instances, the spurious members are distinguished from the genuine—Where the difference is perceptible, the former are to be excluded, in other cases the separation must be left to God, 450

	PAGE
The care of the general good committed to all according to their respective abilities and charisms,	450
B The Sacraments.	
a. Baptism—"Putting on Christ"—Its twofold reference to the death and resurrection of Christ; includes a reference to the Father and the Holy Spirit—The outward and the inward are supposed to be combined,	451-453
b. The Supper.	
A feast of commemoration, 1 Cor. xi. 24, the celebration of Christ's sufferings and a pledge of constant communion with him; <i>ἐστίν</i> = <i>it represents</i> ; involves a reference to the mutual communion of believers,	453-455
9. The Kingdom of God,	455
A. Its idea and extent.	
a. Its idea.	
Corresponds to the idea of the Church, as a general idea does to a particular. Preparation by means of the Jewish Theocracy—And completed by Christianity; the former sensible and national, the latter spiritual and universal,	455, 456
By faith in Christ, the Messianic kingdom, the <i>αἰὼν μέλλων</i> as opposed to the <i>αἰὼν οὗτος</i> or <i>παραρῶς</i> , becomes already present—Hence the kingdom of God coincides with the idea of the invisible church on earth,	456, 457
But the idea is still imperfectly realized,	457
A threefold application of the term. 1. The present internal kingdom of God, 1 Cor. iv. 20; Rom. xiv. 17. 2. The future completion of it, 1 Cor. vi. 10. 3. The present as one with the future, 1 Thess. ii. 12; 2 Thess. i. 5,	458
b. The heavenly community co-extensive with the invisible church,	458, 459
The kingdom of God embraces a higher spiritual world, in which the archetype of the church is realized—Mankind are united to this higher world by the knowledge of God, Eph. iii. 15, Col. i. 20, compared with Eph. ii. 14,	459
B. Doctrine of the Logos,	460
The doctrine not traceable to external influences, but directly to the self-revelation of the person of Christ,	460, 461
The progressive organic development of the Old Testament idea of a Messiah to the idea of Son of God; but all derived from the historical Christ, ..	461
False derivation from Greek philosophy—Philo's Logos	462
Paul and John alike derive their conceptions from the person of Christ—Close connexion of the doctrine of the Logos with Christian faith and morals, ..	463, 464
Refutation of the assertion that Paul's doctrine of the Logos is found only in the Epistles to the Colossians and the Philippians,	464-469
C. The Kingdom of Evil opposed to the Kingdom of God,	469
The prevalence of sin among mankind connected with the prevalence of evil in the higher world—All ungodliness the power of a spirit whose kingdom is <i>αἰὼν οὗτος</i> —False gods not evil spirits,	469, 470
Christ the destroyer of this kingdom—His death apparently a defeat, but in reality a victory—Charisms the tokens of his triumph, ..	471
The conflict with the kingdom of evil carried on by Christians,	472

CONTENTS.

XXV

PAGES

D. The development of the kingdom of God till its final completion,.....	472
The accomplishment of the scheme of redemption a work of free grace,...	473
a. As opposed to pre-eminence of natural descent,	473
b. As opposed to legal merits,	474
Apparent denial of free self-determination in Rom. ix., yet not the apostle's intention to give a complete theory—But an antithetical reference to the arrogance of the Jews,	474—476
Confidence in their own righteousness the cause of the rejection of the Jews—The Gentiles warned against presumptuous reliances on divine grace.	477
To excite Christian confidence, the apostle refers to the unalterable counsel of divine love—Allusions to the consummation of the kingdom of God,	478, 479
10. The doctrines of the Resurrection and of the State of the Soul after Death.	
a. The doctrine of the Resurrection.	
The spiritual awakening by faith a preparation for the future—The Palingenesis of nature, Rom. viii. 19,	479—480
b. State of the Soul after Death till the Resurrection.	
Whether Paul considered the state of the soul after death till the resurrection to be one of suspended consciousness like sleep?—Apparent ground for it in 1 Thess.	481
But his expectation of continued communion with Christ, as signified in Cor. iv. 16, opposed to this supposition; also Phil. i. 21, 23; 2 Tim. iv. 18,	481—483
Possibility of an alteration in his views by progressive illumination—But a comparison of 1 Cor. xv. with 2 Cor. v. 1, is against this,	483, 484
Therefore he held the unbroken consciousness of the soul after death, even at an earlier period of his ministry, though not then brought forward,	484
c. The Consummation.	
The end of the Mediatorial kingdom and the consummation of all things—Pantheistic misunderstanding of 1 Cor. xv. 28—Whether Paul teaches that there is to be a final restoration of all,	485—487

CHAPTER II.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

The author of this Epistle compared with Paul,	487, 488
Points of agreement in their views,	489
Points of difference—Paul contemplates the Jewish economy as abrogated—In this Epistle it is spoken of as still existing, though only typical,	489—491
Treating of Salvation in its relation solely to the descendants of Abraham, though un-Pauline, not contrary to Paul's sentiments,	492
The work of Christ—The exaltation of Christ to heaven more frequently adverted to than his resurrection—Allusions to the High Priesthood,	492—494
The sufferings of Christ and their relation to the sins of mankind—Christ humbled and Christ glorified,	494, 495

Objective satisfaction made by Christ to the holiness of God,.....	PAGE 495
Faith, that by which the objective satisfaction of Christ is appropriated to the subjective purification of the believer—Faith, hope, and love—As with Paul a more general conception of faith underlies the special application of the idea, 495, 496	495, 496
Relation of the Epistle to the Hebrews to the Alexandrian-Jewish theology and to Philo,	496-497

CHAPTER III.

THE DOCTRINE OF JAMES.

His type of doctrine and his religious character as compared with those of Paul, 498, 499	498, 499
1. Relation of faith and works in connexion with his general view of Christianity.	
Comparison of a pretended faith with a pretended love—Works not the soul of faith, but the marks of its vitality,.....	499, 500
A twofold sense of the term Faith (un-Pauline but not anti-Pauline)—The faith of evil spirits forced and passive—that of Abraham spontaneous, and in harmony with the other principles of the mind (Paul contemplates the objective and causal, James the subjective and practical),.....	500-501
The νόμος used to signify the doctrine of Christ,.....	501
Unity of the law—Love its fulfilment—Language the organ of the whole disposition—The Christian life a work,	501
Christianity as the νόμος τέλειος not merely a new law, but a new internal creation,.....	501
The difference from Paul only in the mode of development,	504, 505
2. His views of the law compared with the Pauline.	
His object was to lead the Jews from Judaism to the Gospel—hence he represents Christ as the fulfiller of the law, Matt. v. 17; and allows its observance by the believing Jews, Acts xv. 21; xxi. 21,.....	505
Paul acted with greater latitude among the Gentiles—Became a Gentile. Gal. ii. 14, which was not required of James, as his ministry was confined to Jews,.....	505
3. The duty of veracity.	
James repeats the injunctions of Christ verbally (Matt. v. 12)—Paul enforces the duty from the mutual relation of Christians, Eph. v. 12, and on certain occasions used forms of asseveration equivalent to an oath,.....	505
4. The free self-determination of man in reference to sin—The sentiments of James on this point form an important supplement to Paul's doctrinal statements,.....	507, 508

CHAPTER IV.

THE DOCTRINE OF JOHN.

	PAGE
John as compared with Paul and James—In John's mind the intuitive element predominates over the dialectic—His Christian course emphatically a life in communion with Christ,	508
1. The central-point of his doctrine—Divine life in Communion with Christ—Death in estrangement from him,	509
The theoretical and the practical are intimately blended in his view—His leading ideas are light, life, and truth, in communion with God through the Logos—Death, darkness, falsehood in separation from him,	509, 510
Satan the representative of falsehood—"A liar and the father of it"—His personality (note)—Truth and goodness—sin and falsehood are one—The children of God, and the children of the world,	510, 511
2. Original estrangement of man from God—Opposition of the <i>σαρκικόν</i> and <i>πνευματικόν</i> —The consciousness of sin a condition of the new life,	511
3. Susceptibility of Redemption.	
Need of an inward sense corresponding to the outward revelation—Hence faith presupposes a preparatory operation of the Holy Spirit—This divine impulse not compulsory; but unsusceptibility voluntary and criminal,	512, 513
Twofold sense of the phrases, <i>εἶναι ἐκ Θεοῦ</i> and <i>εἶναι ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας</i> ,	513
4. The Person and Work of Christ.	
The life of Christ the manifestation of God in human form—Grace and truth in Christ correspond to love and holiness in God,	514, 515
The whole life of Christ a revelation of God—Hence his miracles and the descent of the Spirit only mark a new epoch in his ministry,	515, 516
Christ's miracles intended to lead men to higher views of his <i>δοξα</i> ; meanings of the term Faith in John's writings,	516
Import of the sufferings of Christ—The idea of reconciliation at the basis—The communication of divine life connected with his sacrifice—and depending on his exaltation to glory—The spiritual maturity of his disciples depending negatively on this, but positively on his divine influence—The <i>πνεῦμα ἅγιον</i> the result of his glorification,	517, 518
5. Faith as the Principle of a New Life.	
Faith the one work acceptable to God, John vi. 29—Complete surrender to Christ—One commandment of the Lord, <i>brotherly love</i> ,	519
Faith the victory over the world—A superstitious faith in the Messiah easily changed to absolute unbelief,	520
The children of God, and the children of the devil,	521
Progressive purification of believers,	522
Harmony of John's doctrine with itself and with Paul's,	522, 523
Christian hope,	523, 524
John the representative of mysticism,	524
6. Resurrection and Judgment.	
Peculiarity of John's conceptions—The internal and present predominate—mysticism,	524

Judgment something taking place in the present life—the publication of the Gospel necessarily involves a separation of the susceptible from the unsusceptible — Judgment opposed to *σωτηρία* — The unbeliever condemns himself—The believer is not condemned, 525, 526

But this judgment, and the spiritual awakening, are preparatory to the final judgment and resurrection, 526

7. The Second Coming of Christ.

This is represented by John as internal—First by the coming of the Spirit, xvi. 13, then of Christ's own spiritual coming, 16—Yet a personal visible *παρουσία* is not excluded, 526, 527

8. The Idea of the Church.

Not literally expressed—Yet metaphorically by “one fold and one shepherd,” also the distinction of internal and external communion, 1 Ep. ii. 19, 528

9. The Sacraments.

The institution of Christian baptism not mentioned—But its spiritual element noticed in iii. 3—In the same manner the Supper, vi., 528, 529

The essence of Christianity according to Paul and John—Worshipping God as the Father through the Son, in the communion of the Holy Spirit—This the basis of the doctrine of the Trinity, 530

Closing remarks, 530, 531

HISTORY
OF
THE PLANTING AND TRAINING
OF
THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH
BY THE APOSTLES.

. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS ON THE SOURCES OF THIS HISTORY.

THE manner in which criticism has been recently applied to this branch of history induces us to premise a few words on its sources, as an introduction to the following investigations. Aside from the few notices from other quarters, we must, in order to examine the true nature of the facts involved in this history, carefully compare two sources with one another, namely, the *Epistles* of the Apostles and their companions, — which, their genuineness being ascertained, are the surest sources, — and the narrative known by the name of *The Acts of the Apostles*. As we are prepared to prove the credibility of the latter hereafter in detail, we wish here only to see whether, in passing, some marks of the confidence to be placed in this source do not appear.

In the latter part of the book itself, from chap. xvi. 10, we meet with a striking peculiarity,—the author in several passages speaks in the first person plural, as one of the companions of the Apostle Paul, his fellow-traveller, and therefore an eye-witness of part of the events contained in the history. This is a very important indication of the rank which we must allow to this document as a source of historical information. It may indeed be objected, as has actually been done by Dr. Von Baur, (in his work, *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi*: Stuttgart, 1845, p. 12,)

that the author of the Acts belonged to a later period, but adopted this phraseology because he wished to be regarded as the companion of the Apostle Paul, and to act the part of Luke. But this supposition no unprejudiced person can adopt. For then how can it be explained that the author does not from the beginning give some sign of the part he was acting, and in which it was so important for him to be acknowledged; that he does not also, where he first begins to adopt this style, drop some hint as to who he is, and how he happened to be in Paul's company? This really looks in itself, and especially according to the analogy of the apocryphal writings of that age, as unlike one who wished to write under the name of another, as can be imagined. The manner in which the author of the Acts at once, without anything leading to it, begins to express himself in this associated form of address, bears undeniable marks of the absence of design.

And for whom did the author compose this work? As by the introductory words it is connected with the Gospel of Luke, and professes to be the second part of that work on the primitive history of Christianity, it is evident that it was primarily written for the same object which the author of the Gospel states in his introduction—to furnish an individual, Theophilus, with exact and certain knowledge of that history; and this certainly does not agree with his wishing to act the part of any other person than he really was. Here again it may be objected—these writings were not really composed for such a Theophilus, but he who forged the work under the name of a companion of the Apostle Paul chose this garb for his fabrication. But the introductory words of Luke's Gospel are by no means suited to give us the impression of such a design, but correspond in a simple, natural manner to the object which a Christian writer might have who lived under the relations of that fresh age of Christianity. And further, why should he in those words (Luke i. 2) have stated that the accounts of eye-witnesses formed the main sources of his narrative, when in consistency with the part he wished to act he ought to have described himself as an eye-witness? Or must we refer those introductory words only to the Gospel, and not at the same time to the Acts? But if persons are resolved to find a fabrication undertaken for a special purpose, must they not also, as most natural, assume that the author from the first had the whole plan of his *fraus pia* in his mind, and hence in the introductory words to the first part of his work had made preparation for what he intended to exhibit in the second part?

If, now, this personal form of the narrative in the Acts is not a fabri-

cation, having a special end in view, it can be explained only in one of two ways. Either the same person speaks here from whom the whole history proceeded, or it is the account of another individual, which the author, using various sources for his work, incorporated in its original form with his own composition. If we suppose the first, it is evident that the work proceeded from one who was an eye-witness of part of the events he describes, and who as a missionary companion of the Apostle Paul, stood in close connection with him. And this will predispose us to judge favorably of the sources which the author might make use of, for those transactions in which he was not an eye-witness, as well as of the general fidelity of his narrative. We shall not allow ourselves to be persuaded that such a person, instead of wishing to give pure history, only aimed at compiling from the materials before him a fiction, even though for a good object. But if we adopt the second alternative, it follows, that at least an important portion of the narrative is founded on the report of a trustworthy eye-witness. From a single example of the use of such a report, it is apparent that the author wished to employ, and did employ, good sources of information. And by this single example, of leaving unaltered the personal form of narrative, when another would have been more suitable, he shows that he regarded truth more than historic art—the fidelity of the narrative more than unity of historical composition. It is plain how deficient he was in historic art, and that therefore we must expect to find rather the raw material from the sources within his reach, than an historical composition cast after one idea, and in one mould. It is plain how little we should expect that such a person would, like the classical historians, have constructed with creative art the speeches he reports, according to the point of view and character of each speaker, and how little such art and ability can be attributed to him.

Both suppositions have their difficulties, which in either case can find their solution only in the peculiarity of the historian, and in the whole method of his work. In the one case, the carelessness and awkwardness which allowed him to admit these foreign accounts without altering the unsuitable form of the narrative, is wholly unaccountable. But if we adopt the other supposition, it still remains very strange and awkward, that he should appear speaking in this form all at once without notice; without saying anything about the manner in which he came to be one of Paul's companions; how by turns he is associated with him and separated from him. But in both cases we shall be led to similar conclusions in reference to the origination and character of this historical collection.

Whether the introductory words of Luke's Gospel do or do not refer to both parts of the work, at all events we can apply what is there said (Luke i. 2) to the Acts, that he made use of the reports of the original eye-witnesses of the Christian history, and of the first publishers of the Gospel; which could be pertinently said by Luke, to whom ecclesiastical tradition attributes both works, to the physician whom Paul, in his Epistle written from Rome, names as his fellow-laborer. It is true, that to refer these words in the Gospel to the Acts would not favor the supposition, that the account in which he uses the first person proceeded from himself; for by that supposition he himself would belong to the eye-witnesses. Yet it is questionable whether these words really belong to both parts, and whether the author, when writing the Gospel, had already in mind that continuation of it.

BOOK I.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH IN PALESTINE, PREVIOUS TO ITS SPREAD AMONG HEATHEN NATIONS.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH ON ITS FIRST APPEARANCE AS A DISTINCT RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY.

THE Christian Church, as a community, proceeding from the new principle that was to transform the world, and destined to introduce this new principle into humanity, presupposes, as the basis of its existence, the Person who was himself in his whole being and manifestation that world-transforming principle, without whom the existence of the church itself would be a monstrous lie. But in order to the commencement of the existence of the church, there was also a necessity for that unparalleled event affecting all succeeding ages, by which this objective principle passed into the consciousness of men, henceforth to form the central point of that new internal life-communion on which the very essence of the church depends. This event was the miracle of the first Pentecost, which, in its essential nature, is repeated wherever a creation of the Christian life, either in individuals or in communities, takes place. If all the great epochs in the development of the church point us to a beginning which marks the boundary between the old and the new, where first that which constitutes the peculiarity of the new epoch is manifested, certainly the greatest epoch, from which all the others proceeded, cannot be thought to want such a beginning; and historical traditions here harmonize with what the idea of the thing itself would lead us to anticipate. And however much the explanation of particular points in that tradition may be disputed, the historical reality of the fact on the whole remains unshaken and raised above all attempts at mythical explanation, and its truth is shown by itself, as well as by the results which were consequent on it.

The historical development of the Christian church as a body, is similar to that of the Christian life in each of its members. In the latter case, the transition from an unchristian to a Christian state is not an event altogether sudden, and without any preparatory steps. Many separate

rays of divine light, at different times, enter the soul ; various influences of awakening preparative grace are felt, before the birth of that new divine life by which the whole character of man is destined to be taken possession of, pervaded, and transformed. The appearance of a new personality sanctified by the divine principle of life, necessarily forms a great era in life, but the commencement of this era is not marked with perfect precision and distinctness ; the new creation manifests itself more or less gradually by its effects. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh, nor whither it goeth." The same may be affirmed of the church collectively, with this difference, however, that here the point of commencement is more visibly and decidedly marked.

It is true, that Christ, during his ministry on earth, laid the foundation of the outward structure of the church ; he then formed that community, that spiritual Theocracy, whose members were held together by faith in, and confession of, Him as their theocratic King. The community of disciples who acknowledged Him as their Lord and master—their theocratic king—formed the scaffolding for the future structure of the church. But it was as yet the letter without the spirit, the outward form without the inward power. The vital principle of this community, which once in existence, should become the imperishable seed for the propagation of the church in all ages, had not yet germinated. As Christ himself said : "If the seed fall not into the earth and die it remaineth alone, but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit ;" so that fountain of divine life which should afterward flow forth over the whole human race, was, during his existence on earth, shut up in him alone. From the independent possession and individual form of this divine life there had not yet been wrought out—as was essential to the very idea of a Christian church—a community. The Apostles themselves were still entirely dependent on the sensible presence and outward guidance of Christ. Although by their intercourse with Him, and by his spiritual operations on them, they had already received the germ of a divine life which had manifested itself in single exercises, it had not yet become an independent power, a permanent possession, the animating principle of each man's individuality. Hence, they could easily believe everything to be lost when He who was all to them, was withdrawn from their sensible vision. He whom they believed dead must again appear to them in a new form of being, lifted above the reach of death—as the divine living One over whom death had no power—in order to raise them to the consciousness of a communion with him, which nothing could ever again destroy. He appeared unexpectedly among them, filled them with the sense of His presence, and then vanished out of their sight, that they might become gradually assured of their spiritual communion with Him, even when he was not sensibly present. All these impressions which the Saviour by repeated interviews after his resurrection left with them, were an important preparation for that great event which was to mark the

beginning of a new epoch. Such especially was that meeting at which, after pronouncing peace on his disciples, and repeating what he had previously said, that as the Father had sent Him, so He sent them, he declared with a pertinent symbolic sign that they should receive the Holy Spirit, who alone was able to qualify them for that work to which he had set them apart. This act prefiguring that which would be fully realized only in the future, but yet by its immediate effect preparing for that later event, was not without special significance. It is because that great event so prefigured and prepared for, was accomplished at the time of the first Pentecost celebrated by the disciples after the Saviour's departure, that this feast is of so great significance, *as marking the commencement of the Apostolic Church*, for here it first made an outward manifestation of itself according to its inner nature. Next to the appearance of the Son of God himself on earth, this event most distinctly marked the commencement of that new divine life, which, proceeding from Him to all mankind, has since spread and operated through successive ages, and will continue to operate until its final object is attained, and the whole race is transformed into the image of Christ. If we contemplate this great transaction from this, its only proper point of view, we shall not be tempted to explain the greater by the less; we shall not consider it strange that the most wonderful event in the inner life of mankind should be accompanied by extraordinary outward appearances, as sensible indications of its existence. Still less shall we be induced to look upon this great transaction—in which we recognise the necessary beginning of a new epoch, an essential intermediate step in the religious development of the Apostles, and in the formation of the Church—as something purely mythical.

The disciples must have looked forward with intense expectation to the fulfilment of that promise, which the Saviour had so emphatically repeated.* Ten days had passed since their final separation from their

* Professor Hitzig, in his *Sendschreiben über Ostern und Pfingsten*, (Letters on Easter and Pentecost,) Heidelberg, 1837, maintains that this event occurred not at the Jewish Pentecost, but some days earlier, as also the day of the giving of the Law from Sinai is to be fixed some days earlier; that Acts ii. 1, is to be understood, "when the day of Pentecost drew near," and therefore denotes a time before the actual occurrence of this feast. As evidence for this assertion it is remarked that, in verse 5, only the Jews *settled* in Jerusalem, those who, out of all the countries in which they were scattered, had settled in Jerusalem from a strong religious feeling, are mentioned, when, if the reference had been to one of the principal feasts, the multitude of *foreign* Jews, who came from all parts, would have been especially noticed. Against this view we have to urge the following considerations: The words, Acts ii. 1, "When the day of Pentecost was fully come," would be most naturally understood of the actual arrival of that day; as "fulness of time," *πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου*, or "of times," *τῶν καιρῶν*, Eph. i. 10, and Gal. iv. 4, denotes the actual arrival of the appointed time; though we allow that, in certain connections, they may denote the near approach of some precise point of time, as in Luke ix. 51, where yet it is to be noticed that it is not said "*the day*," but "*the days*;" and thus the time of the departure of Christ from the earth, which was now actually approaching, is marked in general terms. But as to this passage in the Acts, if we understand the words only of

Divine Master, when that feast was celebrated, whose object so nearly touched that which especially occupied their minds at the time, and must therefore have raised their anxious expectations still higher—the Jewish Pentecost, the feast which was held seven weeks after the Passover. This feast, according to the original Mosaic institution, related indeed only to the first fruits of Harvest, nor is any other reason for its celebration adduced by Josephus and Philo, and so far, only a distant resemblance could have been traced between the first fruits of the natural Creation and those of the new Spiritual Creation. This analogy, it is true, is often adverted to by the ancient Fathers of the Church, but before the fulfilment of the Saviour's promise, must have been very far from the thoughts of the disciples. But if we may credit the Jewish Traditions,* this feast had also a reference to the giving of the law on Mount Sinai;† hence it especially was called the feast of the joy of the Law.‡ If this be admitted, then the words of Christ respecting the new revelation of God by him,—the new relation established by him between God and Man, which he himself, under the designation of the New Covenant,§ placed in opposition to the Old,—must have been vividly recalled

the near approach of Pentecost, we do not see why such a specification of the time should have been given, since there is no mention at all of the Pentecost after this. Had Luke had in mind a day of giving the Law on Sinai different from that of the Pentecost, it might be expected that he would have marked more precisely the time in point, which he must have supposed to be known at least to his readers. Besides, there are no traces to be found that a day in commemoration of the giving of the Law was observed by the Jews. But if we understand the words as referring to the actual arrival of Pentecost, the importance of fixing the time, in relation to the words immediately following, and the whole sequel of the narrative, is very apparent. This feast would occasion the assembling of believers at an early hour. The words in verse 5, taken by themselves, we should doubtless have to understand merely of such Jews as were resident in Jerusalem, not of such as came there first at this time. But, from a comparison with the 9th verse, it is evident that “to dwell,” *κατοικεῖν*, is not to be understood altogether in the same sense in both verses; that, in the latter, those are spoken of who had their residence elsewhere, and were only sojourning for a short time in Jerusalem. And if we grant that the persons spoken of belonged to the number of the Jews who formerly dwelt in other lands, but for a long time past had settled in Jerusalem, as the capital of the Theocracy, it is clear that, by the “strangers of Rome,” *ἐπίδημοῦντες Ῥωμαῖοι*, we must understand such *as for some special cause were just* come to Jerusalem. Further, there were also those called Proselytes, who were found in great numbers at Jerusalem, for some special occasion, and this could be no other than the feast of Pentecost. Doubtless, by “all the dwellers at Jerusalem,” v. 14, who are distinguished from the Jews, are meant all who were then living at Jerusalem, without determining whether they had resided there always, or only for a short time. The whole narrative, too, gives the impression that a greater multitude of persons than usual were then assembled at Jerusalem.

* Which may be found collected in a Dissertation by J. A. Danz, in Meuschen's *Novum Testamentum e Talmude Illustratum*, p. 740.

† That they are justified in making such a reference, may be concluded from comparing Exodus xij. 2, and xix. 1.

‡ שְׂמֵחַת הַתּוֹרָה

§ The word *διαθήκη*, בְּרִית, (covenant,) which has been used to denote both the Old and the New Dispensation, is taken from human relations, as signifying a covenant or

to the minds of the disciples by the celebration of this feast, and, at the same time, their anxious longing must have been more strongly excited for that event, which, according to his promise, was to confirm and glorify the New Dispensation. As all who professed to be the Lord's disciples (their number then amounted to one hundred and twenty)* were wont to meet daily for mutual edification, so on this solemn day they were assembled in a chamber,† which, according to Oriental customs, was specially assigned to devotional exercises. It was the first stated hour of prayer, about nine in the morning, and, according to what we must suppose was then the tone of the disciples' feelings, we may presume that their prayers turned to the object which filled their souls; that, on the day when the Old Law had been promulgated with such glory, the New also might be glorified by the communication of the promised Spirit. And what their ardent desires and prayers sought for, what their Lord had promised, was granted. They felt elevated to a new state of mind, and penetrated by a spirit of joyfulness and power, to which they

agreement; but in its application to the relation between God and man, the fundamental idea must never be lost sight of, namely, that of a relation in which there is something reciprocal and conditional, as, in this case, a communication from God to man is conditioned by the obedience of faith on the part of the latter.

* Without doubt, those expositors adopt the right view who suppose that not merely the apostles but all the believers were at that time assembled; for though, in Acts i. 26, the apostles are primarily intended, yet the "disciples," *μαθηταί*, collectively, form the chief subject, (i. 15,) to which the "all," *ἅπαντες*, at the beginning of the second chapter necessarily refers. It by no means follows, that because, in ch. ii. 14, the apostles alone are represented as speakers, the assembly was confined to these alone; but here, as elsewhere, they appear as the leaders and representatives of the whole church, and thus are distinguished from the rest of the persons met together; Acts ii. 15. The great importance of the fact which Peter brings forward in his discourse—that the gifts of the Spirit, which, under the Old Covenant, were imparted only to a select class of persons, such as the prophets, under the New Covenant, which removes every wall of separation in reference to the higher life, are communicated without distinction to all believers—this great fact would be altogether lost sight of if we confined everything here mentioned to the apostles. Throughout the Acts, wherever the agency of the Spirit is manifested by similar characteristics in those who were converted to a living faith, we perceive an evident homogeneity with this first great event.

† Such a chamber was built in the eastern style, on a flat roof, and with a staircase leading to the courtyard, *ὑπερῶν*, *ἑλῖ*, (upper chamber.) According to the narrative in the Acts, we must suppose it to have been a chamber in a private house. But, in itself, there is nothing to forbid our supposing that the disciples met together in the Temple at the first hour of prayer during the feast; their proceedings would thus have gained much in notoriety, though not in real importance, as Olshausen maintains; for it perfectly accorded with the genius of the Christian Dispensation, not being restricted to particular times and places, and obliterating the distinction of profane and sacred, that the first effusion of the Holy Spirit should take place, not in a temple, but in an ordinary dwelling. It is stated, it is true, in Luke xxiv. 53, that the disciples "*were continually in the temple,*" and hence it might the more reasonably be concluded that this was the case on the morning of this High Feast; yet it might be possible that, when Luke wrote his Gospel, he had not yet obtained exact knowledge of the particulars of these events, or that he made here only a brief, general statement of them.

had hitherto been strangers, they were seized by an inspiring impulse, to testify to the grace of redemption, which now for the first time they experienced. Extraordinary appearances of nature (a conjunction similar to what has happened in other important epochs in the history of mankind) accompanied the great process then going on in the spiritual world, and were symbolic of that which filled their inmost souls. An earthquake, attended by a whirlwind, suddenly shook the building in which they were assembled, a symbol to them of that Spirit which moved their inner man. Flaming lights in the form of tongues streamed through the chamber, and floating downwards settled on their heads, a symbol of the new tongues of the fire of inspired emotion, which streamed forth from the holy flame that glowed within them.*

The account† of what took place on this occasion, leads us back at last to the depositions of those who were present, the only persons who could give direct testimony concerning it. And with these it might have happened, that the glory of the inner life then imparted to them so reflected its splendor on surrounding objects that, by virtue of the internal miracle, (the elevation of their inward life and consciousness,) through the power of the Divine Spirit, the objects of outward perception appeared quite changed. And thus it is not impossible that everything which presented itself to them as a perception of the outward senses, may have been, in fact, only a perception of the predominant inward mental state, a sensuous objectiveness of what was operating inwardly with divine power, similar to the ecstatic visions which are elsewhere mentioned in Holy Writ. Whatever may be thought of this explanation, what was divine in the event remains the same, for this was an inward process in the souls of the disciples, in relation to which everything outward was only of subordinate significance. Still, there is nothing in the narrative which renders such a supposition necessary. And if we admit that there was really an earthquake which frightened the inhabitants out of their houses, it is easily explained how, though it happened early in the morning of the feast, at the hour of prayer, a great multitude would be found in the streets, and the attention of one and another being attracted to the extraordinary meeting of the disciples, how also, by degrees, a great crowd of persons, curious to know what was going on, would collect around the house.‡ The question may be asked, By what

* Gregory the Great beautifully remarks: "Hinc est quod super pastores primos in linguarum specie Spiritus Sanctus insedit, quia nimirum quos repleverit, de se protinus loquentes facit." Lib. i. Ep. 25. (The Holy Spirit sat upon the first pastors in the form of tongues, because, doubtless, He moves those whom He has filled with His power immediately to speak of Himself.)

† Though not furnished immediately by an eye-witness, and hence, in single points, failing in that clearness of testimony which would otherwise be expected.

‡ The question is, How are we to explain the difficult words, "this noise," τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης, in Acts ii. 6? The pronoun, "this," ταύτης, might lead us to refer the words to what immediately preceded, the loud speaking of the persons assembled. But then the use of the singular is remarkable, and since verse 2 is the leading one, to which the others are

was the astonishment of the bystanders especially excited? At first sight, the words in Acts ii. 7-11 appear susceptible of but one interpretation, that the passers-by were astonished at hearing Galileans, who knew no language but their own, speak in a number of foreign languages, which they could not have learnt in a natural way;* that, therefore, we must conclude that the faculty was imparted to believers by an extraordinary operation of Divine power, of speaking in foreign languages not acquired by the use of their natural faculties. Accordingly, since the third century,† it has been generally admitted, that a supernatural gift

attached, we might refer ταύτης to the subject of that verse, and the more as "occurring," γενομένης, of verse 6 seems to correspond to the "occurred," ἐγένετο, of verse 2. But not only is it more natural to refer the pronoun ταύτης to what immediately precedes in verse 4, but also verses 3 and 4, rather than verse 2, contain the most important facts in the narrative, which certainly favors the construction, in which "noise," φωνή, is understood of the noise made by the disciples in giving vent to their feelings: φωνή must then be taken as a collective noun, signifying a confused din, in which the distinction of individual voices was lost.

* The words give us no reason to suppose that the by-standers took offence at hearing the disciples speak of divine things in a different language from the sacred one.

† By many of the ancients it has been supposed—what a literal interpretation of the words ii. 8 will allow, and even favor—that the miracle consisted in this, that, though all spoke in one and the same language, each of the hearers believed that he heard them speak in his own; *μίαν μὲν ἐξηχεῖσθαι φωνήν, πολλὰς δὲ ἀκούεσθαι* (one language, indeed, was spoken, but many were heard). Gregory Naz. orat. 44, f. 715, who yet does not propound this view as peculiarly his own. It has lately been brought forward in a peculiar manner by Schneckenburger, in his *Beiträgen zur Einleitung in's Neue Testament*—(Contributions towards an Introduction to the New Testament,) p. 84. The speakers, by the power of inspiration, operated so powerfully on the feelings of their susceptible hearers, that they involuntarily translated what went to their hearts into their mother tongue, and understood it as if it had been spoken in that. By the element of inspiration, the inward communion of feeling was so strongly in exercise, that the lingual wall of separation was entirely taken away. But, in order to determine the correctness of this mode of explanation, it may be of use to inquire, Was the language in which the hearers were addressed quite foreign to them, and the natural medium of human intercourse being thus wholly wanting, did there take place a miracle which produced an immediate understanding? Or was the Aramaic language of the speakers not altogether foreign to the hearers, only not so familiar as their mother-tongue: it being an effect of the inward communion produced by the power of spiritual influence, that they easily understood those who spoke in an unaccustomed language, without feeling the want of a familiarity with it; what was said being so deeply felt, it was as intelligible as if spoken in their mother-tongue? This would be, although on the supposition of a powerful spiritual influence, by which the essence of the Pentecostal miracle is not denied but presupposed, an explicable psychological fact. We should think of them as men, speaking with the ardor of inspiration, who made an impression on those not capable of understanding a language foreign to them, similar to what we are told of Bernard's Sermons in Germany on the Crusades, that, "speaking to the German people, he was listened to with marvellous emotion; and their devotion seemed to be excited more by his discourse, which it was not in their power to understand, inasmuch as they were men of another tongue, than by the intelligible address of any interpreter, however skilful, speaking after him; and the beating of their breasts, and the pouring forth of their tears, clearly proved this," quod Germanicis etiam populis loquens miro audiebatur affectu; et de sermone ejus, quem intelligere, utpote alterius lingue homines, non valebant, magis quam ex peritissimi cujuslibet post eum loquentis inter-

of tongues was imparted on this occasion, by which the more rapid promulgation of the gospel among the heathen was facilitated and promoted. And it might be said that, as in the apostolic age, many things were effected immediately by the predominating creative agency of God's Spirit, which, in later times, have been effected through human means appropriated and sanctified by it; so, in this instance, immediate inspiration stood in the place of those natural lingual acquirements, which in later times have served for the propagation of the gospel.

But, certainly, the utility of such a gift of tongues for the spread of divine truth in the apostolic times, will not appear so great, if we consider that the gospel had its first and chief sphere of action among the nations belonging to the Roman Empire, where the knowledge of the Greek and Latin languages sufficed for this purpose, and that the one or the other of these languages, as it was employed in the intercourse of daily life, could not be altogether strange to the Jews. As to the Greek language, the mode in which the apostles expressed themselves in it, the traces of their mother-tongue which appear in their use of it, prove that they had obtained a knowledge of it, according to the natural laws of lingual acquirement. In the history of the first propagation of Christianity, traces are never to be found of a supernatural gift of tongues for this object. Ancient tradition, which names certain persons as interpreters of the apostles, implies the contrary.* Also, Acts xiv. 11 shows that Paul possessed no supernatural gift of tongues. Yet all this does not authorize us to deny the reference to such an endowment in the former passage of the Acts, if the explanation of the whole passage, both in single words and in its connexion, is most favorable to this interpretation.

pretis intellecta locutione, ædificari illorum devotio videbatur, cujus rei certa probatio tunsio pectorum erat et effusio lacrimarum. Mabillon. ed. Opp. Bernard. tom. ii. p. 1119. And this would for the most part agree with the interpretation of my honored friend Dr. Stendel. But as to the first mode of explanation, we do not see what can allow or justify our substituting for the common interpretation of the miracle in question another, which does not come nearer the psychological analogy, but, on the contrary, is further from it, and does not so naturally connect itself with the narrative as a whole. As to an appeal to the analogy with the phenomenon of animal magnetism, we find indeed nothing objectionable in referring to such an analogy, any more than in general to the analogy between the supernatural and the natural, provided the difference of psychical circumstances, and of the causes producing them, is not lost sight of; but yet, in matters of science, where everything must be well grounded, we cannot attach a value to such testimony until it is ascertained what is really trustworthy in the accounts of such phenomena. As to the second mode of interpretation, it can only be maintained by our first adopting the supposition, that we have here not a tradition from the first source, but a representation, which only mediately depends on the report of eye-witnesses, and by allowing ourselves, therefore, to distinguish what the author says from the facts lying at the basis of his narrative.

* Thus Mark is called the "interpreter," *ἐρμηνεύς* or *ἐρμηνευτής* of Peter, (see Papias of Hierapolis in Eusebius, Ecc. Hist. iii. 39, compared with Irenæus, iii. 1). The Basilidians say the same of one Glaucias, Clement's Stromata, vii. 765. On comparing every thing, I must decide against the possible interpretation of those words favored by several

But we shall be led to dissimilar results as we proceed from the description of the occurrences in the church at Corinth, which we find in the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, or from the account in the Acts of the Apostles of the wonders on the day of Pentecost. An unprejudiced examination, as we shall show more fully in the sequel, can leave no doubt that the extraordinary appearances in the Corinthian church are to be attributed not to speaking in foreign languages, but to speaking in an ecstatic and highly elevated state of mind. The account in the Acts would certainly, on a superficial view, lead us only to the notion of foreign languages, and several passages might without violence be explained to mean nothing else than that the author of the account referred to the use of such foreign languages. If now we were justified in the opinion that the same idea of the gift of tongues is applicable to all the appearances of this kind in the Apostolic age; and if we must set out from one principal passage for determining this idea; then we should use for this purpose the record contained in the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, inasmuch as it gives direct evidence on the subject, and possesses greater clearness and distinctness, rather than the account in the Acts, which is defective in these qualities, and in its existing form could not have proceeded immediately from an eye-witness. But the opinion that the idea conveyed by "speaking in other or new tongues" must have been the same from the beginning, we cannot hold with such certainty as to apply it to every single passage in spite of all the difficulties that present themselves, unless the exposition of all the passages taken separately lead to the same fundamental idea. Now although, as follows from what has been said above, the ancient opinion that the apostles were furnished in a supernatural manner with a knowledge of languages for the publication of the Gospel, cannot be maintained; yet, by the account in the Acts, as long as we explain it by itself alone, we might be led to that view, only a little modified. And we do not venture to decide, *à priori*, that the communication of such a supernatural gift of tongues was an impossibility. It must be our special business, first of all, to harmonize the facts as they are reported in the historical records, for not till then can we examine how they are re-

eminent modern critics—that they mean simply an expositor, one who repeated the instructions of Peter in his Gospel, with explanatory remarks;—for this designation of Mark is always prefixed to early accounts of his Gospel, and at the same time from the fact of his acting in this capacity with Peter, his capability is inferred to note down the report made by him of the Evangelical history. Thus certainly the passage in Papias must be understood: *Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτῆς Πέτρου γενόμενος, ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν, ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν*, (Mark, who was the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately whatever he remembered.) The second fact, that he wrote accurately, is founded on the first, that he accompanied Peter as an interpreter. We may well suppose that some truth lies at the basis of this tradition; that although Peter was not ignorant of the Greek language, and could express himself in it, he yet took with him a disciple who was thoroughly master of it, that he might be assisted by him in publishing the gospel among those who spoke that language. Or we must refer the tradition to the Latin language.

lated to the known laws of the world and of human nature; those laws according to which we see the Divine Spirit and Christianity operate on all other occasions. If now we compare all that is known to us in this last respect, we shall never find that the immediate illumination of the Holy Spirit takes the place of the intellectual faculty, or infuses in an immediate manner *that* knowledge which might be attained by the natural application of the understanding and the memory. According to the same law by which that is not communicated by the light of the Holy Spirit which can be discovered by the intelligent use of the art of interpretation, it was not the office of this Spirit to communicate a complete knowledge of languages. The apostles learnt languages when they needed them, in the same manner and according to the same laws as any other persons, under the guidance of that Spirit who endowed them for their vocation in general. We may indeed find examples of immediate intuition, or tact, or feeling, which, in certain moments, allows that to be known which otherwise it would take a longer time to acquire by a continued effort of the understanding. In other cases it happens that one person by a certain intuitive power or immediate feeling knows what another must acquire in a more tedious way. But although the apostles were obliged to learn languages in the common way, yet we do not venture to assert that, at the time when the new creation called into being by Christ first became consciously known to the disciples, something very different from the ordinary course of things might not have happened. We could imagine that the great divine event which was to communicate a higher spiritual life to mankind, and to remove from among the nations of the earth all the oppositions arising from, or connected with, sin, might also be outwardly manifested by breaking down the limits of national peculiarities and languages: by virtue of the connexion, which as yet we are far from perfectly comprehending, between the inward and outward life of the spirit, between the inward view or thought, and its outward expression, language, such a sudden conjuncture might result, a symbolical prophetic wonder, to shadow forth how the new divine life which here first of all manifested itself would claim all the tongues of mankind as its own, how by means of Christianity the separation of nations would be overcome. In one brief act there would thus be a representation of what is grounded in the essence of the redemption accomplished by Christ,—an immediate anticipation of what through a course of ages was mediately to be developed.

This view we should certainly be compelled to adopt, if we could venture to make use of the account in the Acts as the report of an eye-witness, and a narrative derived from a single source. Without doing violence to the words, we cannot fail to perceive, according to Acts ii. 6, 11, that the person from whom the account, as there given, proceeded, regarded the disciples as speaking in various foreign languages which had been hitherto unknown to them. But we have here hardly an account from the first hand, and we find means, indeed, to distinguish the

original account of the transaction from the modification given to it in the later composed narrative. If those who came from distant parts had heard the Galileans speak in foreign languages which must have been unknown to them, this must have appeared to every one, even such as were wholly unsusceptible of the divine in the event, as something extraordinary, although they had felt too little interest for the deeper meaning of the transaction, or had been too thoughtless to reflect on what formed the groundwork and cause of so inexplicable a phenomenon. But now, though previously mention had been made of speaking in unknown, foreign languages, yet the persons introduced in the following verses (12 and 13), express their astonishment, not as at such an extraordinary occurrence, but only as respecting something which surprised the sober-minded part of the spectators, so as to leave them in doubt what it meant, while others, the altogether rude and carnally-minded, supposed they witnessed only the signs of intoxication. All this suits very well, if we take it as describing the impression made by the announcement of the novel things relating to the kingdom of God, uttered in a state of elevated emotion. Such utterance must have so affected the different classes of hearers that some must have been amazed by what they could not comprehend, while others would throw ridicule on the whole affair as a mere exhibition of riotous enthusiasm. And what the Apostle Peter says in ii. 15, in answer to that charge, seems rather to confirm this explanation than the other. Why should he have referred to the fact that it was not the time of day in which men indulge in drinking, when he could have brought forward proofs suited to enlighten the carnal multitude, that an effect like this, the ability to speak foreign, unknown languages, could not be one of the effects of intoxication?

And if we look now at the first words with which the narrative of these great events begins, we shall not find ourselves compelled by them to form such a representation as is derived from vv. 7—12. It is said in v. 4, "And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance." By these "other tongues," which differed from common human tongues—tongues as they were new-created by the power of the Holy Ghost—we are by no means obliged to understand *foreign* languages. So we find, even in this narrative, elements which point to something else than what we should infer from vv. 7—12. And even these words cannot literally be understood of purely distinct foreign languages. It is certain that among the inhabitants of the cities in Cappadocia, Pontus, Lesser Asia, Phrygia Pamphylia, Cyrene, and in the parts of Libya and Egypt inhabited by Grecian and Jewish colonies, the Greek language was at that time for the most part more current than the ancient language of the country. There remain out of the whole list of languages only the Persian, Syriac, Arabic, Greek and Latin languages. Unquestionably, therefore, the description is rather rhetorical than purely historical.

If now we look at still other passages in the Acts in which this gift of tongues is mentioned, there appears in them nothing of the kind which we find in the one under consideration. As speaking with new tongues was one of the first marks of the consciousness that proceeded from the new divine life communicated by Christ, one of the most prominent marks of the new Christian inspiration, so this was everywhere repeated where that event of the first Christian Pentecost was renewed, where the Christian life and consciousness first revealed itself, as when, during the preaching of the Apostle Peter, faith germinated in the already prepared hearts of the Gentiles, and they received the first divine impression of the power of the Gospel (Acts x. 46); or as when the disciples of John at Ephesus were first instructed fully respecting Christ and the Holy Spirit imparted by him, and received Christian baptism, Acts xix. 6. In such situations and circumstances, the power of speaking in foreign languages would have been without object or significance. Whenever the consciousness of the grace of Redemption and of a heavenly life springing from it, was awakened in man, his own mother-tongue, and not a foreign language, would be the most natural channel for expressing his feelings; otherwise, we must suppose the exertion of a magical power gaining the mastery over men, and forcing them, like unconscious instruments, to express themselves in foreign tones; a thing contrary to all analogy in the operations of Christianity.

In the first of the two passages we have just quoted, (Acts x. 46,) "speaking with tongues" is connected with "magnifying God," which intimates the relation between these two acts,—the former being a particular mode of the latter. In the second passage, (Acts xix. 6,) "speaking with tongues" is followed by "prophesying" (*προφητεύειν*); and as by this (the full explanation of which we reserve for the sequel) is to be understood addresses in a state of spiritual elevation, it may be regarded as something allied to the former.

If we proceed now from this point, we shall be led to the following opinion: The new spirit which filled the disciples, of which they were conscious as a common animating principle, created for them a new language; the new feelings and intuitions revealed themselves in new words; the new wine required new bottles. We know not whence is derived the origin of this designation, "speaking with tongues," seized as it is from life, and corresponding to the essence of the matter. A true tradition perhaps lies at the foundation of the critically-suspected passage at the close of Mark's Gospel, so that Christ himself may have designated the speaking in new tongues as one mark of the operations of the Spirit, which he imparted to his disciples. At all events, we find what is related to it in meaning in the discourses of Christ,—the promise of speaking with the new power which would be imparted to the disciples by the Holy Spirit, and of the 'new mouth and wisdom' (Luke xxi. 15) that he would give them. At the beginning, this speaking with tongues could not have been employed for the instruction of others, but could

only have been an immediate involuntary expression of the heart impelled by inward pressure to reveal itself in words. We have no reason for taking any other view of the first Pentecostal day. Peter's discourse was the first intelligible utterance for others, the "interpretation," *ἐρμηνεία*, of the new tongues, or the added "prophesying," *προφητεύειν*. Thus it was perhaps something additional to the original use of this designation, when, as the various degrees of Christian elevation became separated from one another, the "speaking in tongues" was used especially to designate in the highest degree, spiritual elevation, that ecstatic state in which the thinking faculty is less consciously active.

* This continued to be the general use of the term for the first two centuries, until, the historical connection with the youthful age of the church being broken, the notion of a supernatural gift of tongues was formed. On this point it is worth while to compare some passages of Irenæus and Tertullian. Irenæus (lib. v. c. 6) cites what Paul says of the wisdom of the perfect, and then adds, Paul calls those perfect, "Qui perceperunt Spiritum Dei, et omnibus linguis loquuntur per Spiritum Dei, quemadmodum et ipse loquebatur, καθὼς καὶ πολλῶν ἀκούομεν ἀδελφῶν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ προφητικὰ χαρίσματα ἔχόντων καὶ παντοδαπαῖς λαλούντων διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος γλώσσαις καὶ τὰ κρύφια τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰς φανερόν ἀγόντων ἐπὶ τῷ συμφέροντι καὶ τὰ μυστήρια τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκδιηγουμένων, quos et spiritales apostolus vocat ;" (who have received the Spirit of God and speak in all tongues by the Spirit of God, just as he himself spoke, just as, also, we hear many brethren in the church who possess prophetic gifts, speaking through the Spirit in all kinds of tongues, making manifest, for profit, the hidden things of men, and declaring the mysteries of God, whom, also, the Apostle calls spiritual). Though some persons think the term *παντοδαπαῖς* (in all kinds) undoubtedly refers to the languages of various nations, I do not see how that can be, according to its use *at that time*, though the *original* meaning of the word might be so understood. It is particularly worthy of notice, that Irenæus represents this gift as one of the essential marks of Christian perfection, as a characteristic of the "spiritual," *spiritales*. We cannot well comprehend how he could suppose any thing so detached and accidental as speaking in many foreign languages, to stand in so close and necessary a connexion with the essence of Christian inspiration. Besides, he speaks of it as one of those gifts of the Spirit, which continued to exist in the church even in his own times. He evidently considers the "speaking with tongues" as something allied to "prophesying." To the latter, he attributes the faculty of bringing to light the hidden thoughts of men, and to the former that of publishing divine mysteries. He sees nothing but this in the gift of tongues at the effusion of the Holy Spirit, and, in reference to that event, places together "prophesying and speaking with tongues," "prophetari et loqui lingua," l. iii. c. 12. Tertullian, from his Montanistic stand-point, demands of Marcion to point out among his followers proofs of ecstatic inspiration: "Edat aliquem psalmum, aliquam visionem, aliquam orationem duntaxat spiritalem in ecstasi, i. e. amentia, si qua linguæ interpretatio accesserit." (Let him give utterance to some psalm, some vision, some prayer, only let it be spiritual in an ecstasy, if an interpretation of the tongue may be added.) Evidently in this connexion, the term "tongue," *lingua*, expresses speaking in an ecstasy, which, since what is spoken in this state cannot be generally intelligible, must be accompanied by an interpretation. Tertullian also, in the same passage (*adv. Marcion*, l. v. c. 8), applying the words in Isaiah xi. 2 to the Christian church, joins *prophetari* with *linguis loqui*, and attributes both to the "Spirit of Knowledge," *Spiritus agnitionis*, the *πνεῦμα γνώσεως*. Further, as it appears from what has been said, that the gift of tongues was considered as still existing in the church, it is strange that the Fathers never refer to it apologetically, as an undeniable evidence to the heathen of the divine power operating among Christians, in the same manner as they appeal to the gift of heal-

On reviewing the account in the Acts of the Apostles as it lies before us, we certainly recognise in it, according to what has been said, a predominant ideal element, which has infused itself into the conception of the historical, and modified it. If we have assumed as possible that the peculiar essence and aim of Christianity was represented visibly in a symbolic wonder, we shall now be compelled at the close of our inquiry, to regard this not as purely historical and objective, but to transfer it to the subjective point of view, concluding that the conception of the fact, was in this particular instance involuntarily altered. If any persons are disposed to call this a mythical element mingling with the historical, after the preceding explanation of the idea, we shall not dispute about a name. Only we must once for all declare, that such single unhistorical traits can by no means be employed to stamp the whole narrative in which they occur as unhistorical or mythical. After consistent application of such an arbitrary principle of criticism—that in general where anything is found unhistorical or mythical, no real history is to be recognised—very little history would be left; the greater part of history would have to be sacrificed to a destructive criticism, which is everywhere quick to descry departures from the strictly historical.*

Having attempted to explain the nature of the remarkable occurrences of that great day, we will now pursue the narrative farther.

The apostles held it to be their duty to defend the Christian community against the reproaches cast upon it by superficial judges, and to avail themselves of the impression which this spectacle had made on so many, to lead them to faith in Him whose divine power was here manifested. Peter came forward with the rest of the eleven, and as the apostles spoke in the name of the whole church, so Peter spoke in the name of the apostles. The promptitude and energy which made him take the lead in expressing the sentiments with which all were animated, were special gifts, grounded in his natural peculiarities; hence the distinguished place which he had already taken among the disciples, and which he long after held in the first church at Jerusalem. "Think not,"

ing the sick, or of casting out demons, although the ability to speak in a variety of languages not acquired in a natural way, must have been very astonishing to the heathen. In Origen, in whose times the Charismata of the apostolic church began to be considered as something belonging to the past, we find the first trace of the opinion that has since been prevalent, yet even in him the two views are mingled, as might be done in distinguishing the twofold conception, the literal and the spiritual. Compare Ep. ad Roman. ed. De la Rue, t. iv. f. 470, l. vii. f. 602, de Oratione, § 2, tom. i. f. 199. The opposition to Montanism, which had subjected the "speaking with tongues," *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν*, to abuse, as in the Corinthian church, might have contributed to sink into oblivion the more ancient interpretation. The "speaking in strange tongues," *ξενόφωνεῖν*, the "speaking frenziedly and in foreign tongues," *λαλεῖν ἐκφρόνως καὶ ἁλλοτριότροπως* came to be considered as a mark of the spurious Montanist Inspiration, Euseb. Hist. Eccl. v. 16.

* For a more satisfactory view of the "speaking with tongues," see Schaff's History of the Apostolic Church, pp. 199—203.—ED.

said Peter,* "that in these unwonted appearances you see the effects of inebriety. These are the signs of the Messianic era, predicted by the prophet Joel; the manifestations of an extraordinary effusion of the Spirit, which is not limited to an individual here and there, the chosen organs of the Most High, but in which all share who have entered into a new relation to God by faith in the Messiah. This Messianic era will be distinguished, as the prophet foretold, by various extraordinary appearances, as precursors of the last decisive epoch of the general judgment. But whoever believes in the Messiah has no cause to fear that judgment, but may be certain of salvation. That Jesus of Nazareth, whose divine mission was verified to you by the miracles that attended his earthly course, is the very Messiah promised in the Old Testament. Let not his ignominious death be urged as invalidating his claims. It was necessary for the fulfilment of his work as the Messiah, and determined by the counsel of God. The events that followed his death are a proof of this, for he rose from the dead, of which we are all witnesses, and has been exalted to heaven by the divine power. From the extraordinary appearances which have filled you with astonishment, you perceive, that in his glorified state he is now operating with divine energy among those who believe on him. The heavenly Father has promised that the Messiah shall fill all who believe on him with the power of the divine Spirit, and this promise is being fulfilled. Learn, then, from these events, in which you behold the prophecies of the Old Testament fulfilled, the nothingness of all that you have attempted against him, and know that God has exalted him whom you crucified, to be Messiah, the ruler of God's kingdom, and that, through divine power, he will overcome all its enemies."

The words of Peter impressed many, who asked, What must we do? Peter called upon them to repent of their sins, to believe in Jesus as the Messiah who could impart to them forgiveness of sins and freedom from sin,—in this faith to be baptized, and thus outwardly to join the communion of the Messiah; then would the divine power of faith be manifested in them, as it had already been in the community of believers; they would receive the same gifts of the Holy Spirit, the bestowment of which was simultaneous with the forgiveness of sins, and freedom from sin; for the promise had relation to all believers without distinction, even to all in distant parts of the world, whom God by his grace should lead to believe in Jesus as the Messiah.

The question may arise, Whether by these last words Peter intended only the Jews scattered among distant nations, or whether he

* Bleek has correctly perceived traces of a Hebrew original in Acts ii. 24, where consistency of the metaphor requires, *δεσμοὺς τοῦ θανάτου*, bands of death, = *חַבְלֵי מָוֶת* or *בְּנֵי מָוֶת*, the nets or bands of death, (Psalm xviii, 5 and 6,) which the Alexandrian translation renders by *ὠδίνες*, pains, according to the meaning of the word *חַבְלֵי*, pains, bands. See Bleek's review of Mayerhoff's *Hist. Kritischer Einleitung in die petrinischen Schriften*, in the *Studien und Kritiken*. 1836, iv. 1021.

included such among the heathen themselves as might be brought to the faith? As Peter at a subsequent period, opposed the propagation of the gospel among the heathen, there would be an *apparent* inconsistency in now making such a reference. But there is really no such contradiction, for the scruple which clung so closely to Peter's mind was founded only on his belief that heathen could not be received into the community of believers, without first becoming Jewish Proselytes, by the exact observance of the Mosaic law. Now, according to the declarations of the prophets, he might expect that in the Messianic times the heathen would be brought to join in the worship of Jehovah, so that this sentiment might occur to him consistently with the views he then held, and he might express it without giving offence to the Jews. Yet this interpretation is not absolutely necessary, for all the three clauses (Acts ii. 39) might also be used to denote only the aggregate of the Jewish nation in its full extent; and it might rather be expected that Peter, who had been speaking of the Jews present and their children, if he had thought of the heathen also, would have carefully distinguished them from the Jews. But, on the other hand, the description, "All that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call," appears too comprehensive to justify us in confining it to persons originally belonging to the Jewish nation. Hence, it is most probable, that in Peter's mind, when he used this expression, there floated an indistinct allusion to believers from other nations, though it did not appear of sufficient importance for him to give it a greater prominence in his address, as it was his conviction that the converts to Christianity from heathenism must first become Jews.

CHAPTER II.

THE FIRST FORM OF THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY, AND THE FIRST GERM OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

THE existence and first development of the Christian church rests on an historical foundation—on the acknowledgment of the fact that Jesus was the Messiah—not on a certain system of ideas. Christ did not as a teacher propound a certain number of articles of faith, but while exhibiting himself as the Redeemer and Sovereign in the kingdom of God, as the end of all the divine promises, he founded his church on the facts of his life and sufferings, and of his triumph over death by the resurrection. Thus the first development of the church proceeded not from a certain system of ideas set forth in a creed, but only from the acknowledgment of one fact which included in itself all the rest belonging to the essence of Christianity, the acknowledgment of Jesus as the Mes-

siah, which also involved the facts by which he was accredited as such by God, and demonstrated to mankind; namely, his resurrection, glorification, and continual agency on earth for the establishment of his kingdom in Divine power.

Hence, as at first, all those who acknowledged Jesus as the Messiah, withdrew from the mass of the Jewish people, and formed themselves into a distinct community; and as it must happen, that in the course of time, the genuine and false disciples would of themselves separate from each other, so all who acknowledged Jesus as the Messiah were alike baptized without fuller or longer instruction, such as in later times has preceded baptism. There was only one article of faith which constituted the peculiar mark of the Christian profession, and from this point believers were led to a clearer and fuller knowledge of the whole contents of the Christian faith, by the continual enlightening of the Holy Spirit; that article was belief in Jesus as the Messiah. It naturally followed that they ascribed to him the whole idea of what the Messiah, according to a right understanding of the meaning and spirit of the Old Testament promises, was to be,—the Redeemer from sin, the Ruler of the kingdom of God, to whom their whole lives were to be devoted, and whose laws were to be followed in all things. And he would manifest himself as the Ruler of God's kingdom, by the communication of a new divine principle of life, which should impart to those redeemed and governed by him the certainty of the forgiveness of sins; which should mould their whole lives according to the laws of the Messiah and his kingdom, and should be the pledge of all the blessings yet to be imparted to them in the kingdom of God until its consummation. Whoever acknowledged Jesus as the Messiah, received him, consequently, as the infallible, divine prophet, and implicitly submitted to his instructions as communicated by his personal ministry, and afterwards by his inspired organs, the Apostles. Hence baptism at this period, in its peculiar Christian meaning, having reference to this one article of faith which constituted the essence of Christianity, was designated as baptism into Jesus, into the name of Jesus; it was the holy rite which sealed the connexion with Jesus as the Messiah. From this designation of baptism we cannot indeed conclude with certainty that there was no other baptismal formula than this. Still, it is probable that in the original apostolic formula no reference was made except to this one article. This shorter baptismal formula contains in itself every thing which is further developed in the longer formula afterwards generally used; the reference to God, who has revealed and shown himself in and by the Son, as a Father; and to the Spirit of the Father, whom Christ imparts to believers as the new spirit of life, the Spirit of holiness, who, being thus imparted, is distinguished as the Spirit of Christ. That one article of faith included, therefore, the whole of Christian doctrine. But the distinct knowledge of its contents was by no means immediately developed in the minds of the first converts, or freed from foreign admixtures resulting from Jewish modes of thinking,

which, when applied to religion, needed first to be stripped of that national and carnal veil with which they were covered. As the popular Jewish notion of the Messiah excluded many things which were characteristic of this idea as formed and understood in a Christian sense, and as it included many elements not in accordance with Christian views, one result was, that in the first Christian communities formed among the Jews, various discordant notions of religion were mingled; there were many errors arising from the prevailing Jewish mode of thinking, some of which were by degrees corrected in those who surrendered themselves to the expansive and purifying influence of the Christian spirit; but in those over whom that spirit could not exert such power, these errors formed the germ of the later Jewish-Christian (the so-called Ebionitish) doctrine, which set itself in direct hostility to the pure gospel.

Thus we are not justified in assuming that the Three Thousand who were converted on one day, became transformed at once into genuine Christians. The Holy Spirit operated then by the publication of divine truth, according to the same law as in all succeeding ages, not with a sudden transforming magical power, but according to the measure of the free self-determination of the human will. Hence, also, in these first Christian societies, as in all later ones, although originating in so mighty an operation of the Holy Spirit, the foreign and spurious were mingled with the genuine. A powerful impression is not necessarily deeply penetrating and permanent. In fact, the more powerful the energy of the operation, the more easily would it happen that many would be affected whose hearts were not yet susceptible enough for the divine seed to take deep root. And in outward appearance, there were no infallible marks of distinction between genuine and merely apparent conversions. The example of Ananias and Sapphira, and the disputes of the Palestinian and Hellenistic Christians, evince even at that early period, that the agency of the Spirit did not preserve the church entirely pure from foreign admixtures.

The form of the Christian community and of the public Christian worship, the archetype of all the later Christian cultus, arose at first, without any preconceived plan, from the peculiar nature of the higher life that belonged to all true Christians. There was, however, this difference, that the first Christian community constituted as it were one family; the power of the newly awakened feeling of Christian fellowship, the feeling of the common grace of redemption, outweighed all other personal and public feelings, and all other relations were subordinated to this one great relation. But, in later times, the distinction between the church and the family became more marked, and many things which were at first accomplished in the church as a family community, could afterward be duly attended to only in the narrower communion of Christian family life.

The first Christians assembled daily either in the Temple, or in private houses; in the latter case they met in small companies, since their num-

bers were already too great for one chamber to hold them all. Discourses on the doctrine of salvation were addressed to believers and to those who were just won over to the faith, and prayers were offered up. As the predominating consciousness of the joy of redemption influenced and sanctified the whole of earthly life, nothing earthly could remain untransformed by this relation to a higher state. Thus even the daily meal of which believers partook as members of one family was sanctified by it.* They commemorated the last supper of the disciples with Christ, and their brotherly union with one another. At the close of the meal, the presider distributed bread and wine to the persons present, as a memorial of Christ's similar distribution to the disciples. Thus every meal was consecrated to the Lord, and, at the same time, was a meal of brotherly love. Hence the designations afterwards chosen were, *δεῖπνον Κυρίου* and *ἀγάπη*, "Lord's Supper" and "Love-feast.†"

From ancient times an opinion has prevailed, which is apparently favored by many passages in the Acts, that the spirit of brotherly love impelled the first Christians to renounce all their earthly possessions, and to establish a perfect intercommunity of goods. When, in later times, it was perceived how very much the Christian life had receded from the model of this fellowship of brotherly love, an earnest longing to regain it was awakened, to which we must attribute some attempts to effect what had been realized by the first glow of love in the apostolic times—such were the orders of Monkhoo, Canonical Communities of the clergy, the Mendicant Friars, the Apostolici, and the Waldenses in the

* The hypothesis lately revived, that such institutions were borrowed from the Essenes, is so entirely gratuitous as to require no refutation.

† In Acts ii. 42, we find the first general account of what passed in the assemblies of the first Christians. Mosheim thinks, since every thing else is mentioned that is found in later meetings of the church, that the "fellowship," *κοινωνία*, refers to the collections made on these occasions. But the context does not favor the use of the word *κοινωνία* in so restricted a signification, which, therefore, if it were the meaning intended, would require a more definite term. See Meyer's Commentary. We may most naturally consider it as referring to the whole of the social Christian intercourse, two principal parts of which were, the common meal and prayer. Luke mentions prayer last, probably because the connexion between the common meal and prayer, which made an essential part of the love-feast, was floating in his mind. Olshausen maintains (see his Commentary, Trans. ed. by Dr. Kendrick, vol. III. p. 213), that this interpretation is inadmissible, because in the enumeration every thing relates to divine worship, as may be inferred from the preceding expression "doctrine," *διδασχῇ*. But this supposition is wanting in proof. According to what we have before remarked, the communion of the church, and of the family, were not at that time separated from one another; no strict line of demarcation was drawn between what belonged to the Christian cultus in a narrower sense, and what related to the Christian life and communion generally. Nor can the reason alleged by Olshausen be valid, that if my interpretation were correct, the word "fellowship," *κοινωνία*, must have been placed first, for it is altogether in order that *that* should be placed first, which refers alone to the directive functions of the apostles, that then the mention should follow of the reciprocal Christian communion of all the members with one another, and that of this communion two particulars should be especially noticed.

12th and 13th centuries. At all events, supposing this opinion to be well founded, this practice of the apostolic church ought not to be considered as in a literal sense the ideal for imitation in all succeeding ages; it must have been a deviation from the natural course of social development, such as could agree only with the extraordinary manifestation of the divine life in the human race at that particular period. Only the *spirit* and *disposition* here manifested in thus amalgamating the earthly possessions of numbers into one common fund, are the models for the church in its development through all ages. For as Christianity never subverts the existing natural course of development in the human race, but sanctifies it by a new spirit, it necessarily recognises the division of wealth (based on that development), and the inequalities arising from it in the social relations; while it draws from these inequalities materials for the formation and exercise of Christian virtue, and strives to lessen them by the only true and never-failing means,* namely, the power of love. This, we find, agrees with the practice of the churches subsequently founded by the apostles, and with the directions given by Paul for the exercise of Christian liberality, 2 Cor. viii. 13.

And even in the view that this community of goods was only the effect of a peculiar and temporary manifestation of Christian zeal, foreign to the later development of the church, we shall find many difficulties. The first Christians formed themselves into no monkish fraternities, nor lived as hermits secluded from the rest of the world, but, as history shows us, continued in the same civil relations as before their conversion; nor have we any proof that a community of goods was universal for a time, and was then followed by a return to the usual arrangements of society. On the contrary, several circumstances mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, are at variance with the notion of such a relinquishment of private property. Peter said expressly to Ananias that it depended on himself to sell or to keep his land, and that even after the sale, the sum received for it was entirely at his own disposal, Acts v. 4. In the 6th chapter of the Acts, there is an account of a distribution of alms to the widows, but not a word is said of a com-

*As the influence which Christianity exercises over mankind is not always accompanied with a clear discernment of its principles, there have been many erroneous tendencies, which, though hostile to Christianity, have derived their nourishment from it,—half-truths torn from their connexion with the whole body of revealed truth, and hence misunderstood and misapplied; of this, the St. Simonians furnish an example. They had before them an indistinct conception of the Christian idea of equality; but as it was not understood in the Christian sense, they have attempted to realize it in a different manner. They have striven to accomplish by outward arrangements, what Christianity aims at developing gradually through the mind and disposition, and have thus fallen into absurdities. Christianity tends by the spirit of love to reduce the opposition between the individual and the community, and to produce a harmonious interpenetration of interests. St. Simonianism, and such tendencies, on the contrary, consciously or unconsciously in union with the pantheistic spirit of the present day, sacrifice the individual to the community, and thus deprive him of his true vital importance.

mon stock for the support of the whole body of believers. We find in Acts xii. 12, that Mary possessed a house at Jerusalem, which we cannot suppose to have been purchased at the general cost. These facts plainly show, that we are not to imagine, even in this first Christian society, a renunciation of all private property.

On comparing the accounts in the Acts of the Apostles, we must either say, that in single passages which treat of the community of goods everything is not to be understood in a strictly literal sense, since in an artless narrative, even by an eye-witness, if his feelings are excited by the subject of his representation, his picture will easily and naturally receive a higher coloring; or, that in the narrative given in the Acts, the various gradations in the form of this community of goods—the eccentric relation accruing from the first glow of Christian enthusiasm, and the later limitation of the community of goods produced by circumstances, the return of things to their wonted channels,—could not be kept distinct from one another; that things of different kinds were mingled together in the narrative, which might easily happen in an historical representation collected from various sources. Whichever of the two suppositions we prefer, it is plain that no one can be justified, merely on account of this difficulty, in suspecting* the historical authority of the narratives.

At all events, the community of goods practised by the first Christians, whatever form we suppose it to have taken, was something that proceeded from within; it was the natural expression of a spirit which bound them all to one another. Everything here must have sprung from the power of the one Spirit, must have depended solely on the free act of the pure disposition; nothing was effected by the force of outward law. This is manifest in the memorable transaction with Ananias and Sapphira. They both were anxious not to be considered by the apostles and the church as inferior to others in the liberality of their contributions. Perhaps a superstitious belief in the merit of good works was mingled with other motives, so that they wished to be as meritorious as others in God's sight also. They could not, however, prevail on themselves to surrender the whole of their property, but brought a part, and pretended that it was the whole. Peter detected the dissimulation and hypocrisy of Ananias, whether by a glance into the secret recesses of his heart, afforded by the immediate influence of God's Spirit, or by a natural sagacity guided by the same spirit, we cannot decide with certainty from the narrative. Nor is it a question of importance, for who can so exactly draw the line between the divine and the human, in organs animated by the Holy Spirit? The criminality of Ananias did not consist in his not deciding to part with the whole amount of his property; for the words of Peter addressed to him show that no exact measure of giving was prescribed; each one was left to contribute according to his peculiar circumstances and the degree of love that animated him. But the

* Like Dr. Baur.

hypocrisy with which he attempted to make a show of greater love than he actually felt—the falsehood by which, when it took possession of his soul, the Christian life must have been utterly polluted and adulterated—this it was which Peter denounced, as a work of the spirit of Satan, for falsehood is the fountain of all evil. Peter charged him with lying to the Holy Spirit; with lying not to men but to God, since he must have beheld in the apostles the organs of the Holy Spirit speaking and acting in God's name—that God who was himself present in the assembly of believers, as a witness of his intentions—and yet thought that he could obtain credit before God for his good works. Peter uttered his solemn rebuke with a divine confidence springing from a regard to that holy cause which was to be preserved from all foreign mixtures, and from the consciousness of being in an office entrusted to him by God, and in which he was supported by divine power. When we reflect what Peter was in the eyes of Ananias, how the superstitious hypocrite must have been confounded and thunderstruck to see his falsehood detected, how the holy denunciations of a man speaking to his conscience with such divine confidence must have acted on his terrified feelings, and how he must have been seized with alarm, in view of the judgments of a Holy God, we shall not find it very difficult to conceive that the words of the apostle would produce so great an effect. The divine and the natural seem here to have been closely connected. What Paul so confidently asserts in his Epistles to the Corinthians, of his ability to inflict punishment, testifies to the conscious possession by the apostles of such divine power. And when Sapphira, without suspecting what had taken place, three hours after, entered the assembly, Peter at first endeavored to rouse her conscience by his interrogations; but since, instead of being aroused to consideration and repentance, she was hardened in her hypocrisy, Peter accused her of having concerted with her husband, to put, as it were, the Spirit of God to the proof, whether he might not be deceived by her hypocrisy. He then menaced her with the judgment of God, which had just been inflicted on her husband. The words of the apostle were in this instance aided by the impression of her husband's fate, and striking the conscience of the hypocrite, produced the same effect as on her husband. Thus important was this judgment, to guard the first operations of the Holy Spirit from the admixture of that poison which is always most prejudicial to the operations of divine power on mankind, and to secure a reverence for the apostolic authority, which was so necessary as an external governing power for the development of the primitive church, until it had advanced to an independent steadfastness and maturity in the faith.*

* I can by no means assent to Baur's assertion in his work on the Apostle Paul, p. 22, that the Apostles are delineated in the Acts as superhuman, almost as magicians. I cannot approve of his exposition of the passage in Acts v. 13, which he thinks strongly supports his views, understanding the words "*the rest*," *λοιποῖς*, to mean the other Christians of whom none ventured to join themselves to the apostles, but were kept at a distance

The disciples did not immediately attain to a clear understanding of that call, which Christ had already given them by so many intimations,* to form a church entirely separated from the existing Jewish economy; to that economy they adhered; all the forms of the national Theocracy, in which their religious consciousness still, as formerly, exercised itself, were sacred in their esteem, though a higher principle of life had been imparted, by which these were to be more and more spiritualized and transformed. They remained outwardly Jews, although, in proportion as their faith in Jesus as the Redeemer became clearer and stronger, they inwardly ceased to be Jews, and all external rites assumed a different relation to their internal life. It was their belief, that the existing religious forms would continue till the second coming of Christ, when a new and higher order of things would be established, and this great change they expected would shortly take place. No unprejudiced reader of the New Testament can fail to perceive that such an expectation filled the souls of the apostles; and it could not be otherwise. The gaze that is fixed on a distant object can as little measure time as space. To one whose look is directed on the object of his anxiety, the distant appears nigh at hand; he overlooks the windings of the way, which separate him from the object of his anxious expectation. But gradually the objects separate themselves which at first were mingled together in the perspective. So it was with the prophets who gazed on the Messianic times from the Old Testament stand-point; and so it was with the apostles, as they directed their looks to the second advent of Christ. Christ himself has left no distinct information respecting the time in which this decisive event is to happen, but has expressly informed us that it belongs to those hidden things which are known only by their fulfilment. It would require a comparison of the discourses of Christ with one another and deep reflection on their contents, to understand the course of his kingdom's development, and to judge aright respecting the nearness or distance of its end. If, on the one hand, many isolated expressions of Christ which present in perspective the points of greatest moment relating to the progress of his kingdom, may be understood as if that last decisive period were at hand; on the other hand, his parables indicate a slower process of development; as if it would not suddenly, but gradually, and working outwards from within, pervade and penetrate the life of humanity. But naturally these isolated, brief expressions are at first most easily recollected, and absorb the attention. The contents of the parabolic intimations are learnt gradually, and are better under-

by reverential awe. By the "*all*," *ἅπαντες*, in v. 12, can only be understood the collective body of believers, in distinction from the apostles. "*The rest*" distinguished from the *ἅπαντες* can only be those who were not Christians, afterwards called "*the people*," *λαός*, who revered the Christian community on account of the Divine powers displayed in it, a view which is in every respect confirmed by a comparison with ii. 47.

* See Life of Christ, pp. 86, 91, 101, 124, 205.

stood from the history itself. It belonged to the nature of Christianity, that it should represent itself at first, not as a new principle for *earthly history*, as if destined to form a new cultus, and to give a new form to all earthly relations; it was not the idea of a new Christian *time* that came first into consciousness, but everything appeared only as a point of transition to a new, heavenly, eternal order of things which was to be introduced at the second advent. Hence, at first, everything earthly *must* have appeared as ready to vanish, as quickly passing away, and the eye was fixed only on that future heavenly kingdom as the unchangeable state, to which believers in spirit and disposition already belonged. It would only by degrees be rendered apparent that the process of the world's transformation coming forth into outward appearance would not be effected suddenly at the advent of Christ, but must make its way by internal changes in a gradual development. Thus the disciples must at first have contemplated the whole outward system of Judaism from this point of view and in this relation to the approaching kingdom of Christ. Its whole cultus appeared to them as something which must continue to exist, till all things should become new. But here also, as the renewing effect of Christianity was to proceed from within, the true light had not yet risen upon them. Hence the establishment of a distinct mode of worship was far from entering their thoughts, although new ideas respecting the essence of true worship arose in their minds from the light of faith in the Redeemer; they took part in the temple worship with as much interest as any devout Jew. They believed, however, that a sifting would take place among the members of the Theocracy, and that the better part would, by the acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messiah, be incorporated with the Christian community.

But as the believers, in opposition to the mass of the Jewish nation, who remained hardened in their unbelief, now formed a community internally bound together by the one faith in Jesus as the Messiah and by the consciousness of the higher life received from him, it was necessary that this internal union should assume a certain external form. And there already existed among the Jews a model for such a smaller community within the great theocratic national church, which, besides the general temple worship, had its *special means* of edification, viz: the Synagogues. The kind of edification supplied by the Synagogues—expositions by individuals who had applied themselves to the study of the Old Testament, united prayer, and consideration of the divine word—appealing to the spiritual consciousness, and demanding the spiritual participation of all, accorded also with the nature of the new Christian worship. This form of social organization, therefore, as it was copied in all the religious communities founded on Judaism, (such as the Essenes) was also adopted to a certain extent at the first formation of the Christian Church.

But it may be disputed, whether the apostles, to whom Christ committed the chief direction of affairs, designed from the first that believers

should form a society exactly on the model of the synagogue, and, in pursuance of this plan, instituted particular offices for the government of the church corresponding to that model—or whether, without such a preconceived plan, distinct offices were appointed, as circumstances required, in doing which they availed themselves of the model of the synagogue, with which they were familiar.

The advocates of the first view (particularly Mosheim) proceed on the undeniably correct assumption, that the existence of certain presidents at the head of the Christian societies, under the name of Elders, (*πρεσβύτεροι*), must be presupposed though their appointment is not expressly mentioned, as appears from Acts xi. 30. The question arises, therefore, whether far earlier traces cannot be found of the existence of such Presbyters? The appointment of deacons is indeed first mentioned as designed to meet a special emergency, Acts vi. But even here it might be supposed that their office was already in existence. It might be said that the apostles, in order not to be called off from the more weighty duties of their office, appointed from the beginning such almoners; but as these officers hitherto had been chosen only from the native Jewish Christians of Palestine, the Christians of Jewish descent, who came from other parts of the Roman Empire, and to whom the Greek was almost as much their mother tongue as the Aramaic—the Hellenists as they were termed,—believed that they were unjustly treated. On their remonstrance, deacons of Hellenistic descent were especially appointed for them, as appears by their Greek names. As the apostles declared that they were unwilling to be distracted in their purely spiritual employment of prayer and preaching the word, by the distribution of money, it might be inferred that even before this time, they had not engaged in such business, but had transferred it to other persons appointed for the purpose. As still earlier, in Acts v., we find mention made of persons under the title of “young men,” *νεώτεροι, νεανίσκοι*, who considered such an employment as carrying a corpse out of the Christian assemblies for burial as belonging to their office, so these might be supposed to be no other than deacons. And as the title of younger stands in contrast with that of elders in the church, the existence of servants of the church (*διάκονοι*), and of ruling elders (*πρεσβύτεροι*), might seem to be equally pointed out.

But though this supposition has so much plausibility, yet the evidence for it, on closer examination, appears by no means conclusive. It is far from clear that in the last quoted passage of the Acts, the narrative alludes to persons holding a distinct office in the church;* it may very

* Even after what has been urged by Meyer and Olshausen, in their Commentaries on the Acts, against this view, I cannot give it up. In accordance with the relation in which, anciently, and especially among the Jews, the young stood to their elders, it would follow as a matter of course, that the young men in an assembly would be ready to perform any service which might be required. I do not see why (as Olshausen maintains, vol. 3, p. 235) on this supposition, any other term than *νεώτεροι* should have been used—rather we should say, if Luke had wished to designate appointed servants of the church,

naturally be understood of the younger members who were fitted for such manual employment, without any other eligibility than the fact of their age and bodily strength. And, therefore, we are not to suppose that a contrast is intended between the servants and ruling elders of the church, but simply between the younger and older members. As to the Greek names of the seven deacons, it cannot be inferred with certainty from this circumstance that they all belonged to the Hellenists, for it is well known that the Jews often bore double names, one Hebrew or Aramaic, and the other Hellenistic. Still it is possible, since the complaints of the partial distribution of alms came from the Hellenistic part of the church, that, in order to infuse confidence and satisfaction, only Hellenists were chosen on this occasion. Or, it might be supposed† that the additions to the church had been chiefly from the Hellenists, and that their influence predominated in fixing the choice on men of their own number. But from all we know of the composition of the church at Jerusalem, this seems in no way probable. And the complaint of the Hellenists that their widows had been neglected is rather adverse than favorable to such a view. But if these deacons were appointed only for the Hellenists, it would have been most natural to entrust their election to the Hellenistic part alone, and not to the whole church.

Hence we are disposed to believe, that the church was at first composed entirely of members standing on an equality with one another, and that the apostles alone held a higher rank and exercised a directing influence over the whole, according to the original position in which Christ had placed them in relation to other believers; so that the whole arrangement and administration of the affairs of the church proceeded from them, and they were led only by particular circumstances to appoint other church officers. Deacons were first appointed, and their office is, therefore, the oldest of all church offices.

As in the government of the church in general the apostles at first were the sole directors, so all the contributions towards the common fund were deposited with them (Acts v. 2), and its distribution also, according to the wants of individuals, was altogether in their hands. From Acts vi. 2, it cannot be positively inferred, that the apostles had not hitherto been occupied with this secular concern. That passage may be under-

he would not have used this indefinite appellation; nor can I feel the force of Olshausen's objection, that in case of its use, Acts v. 6, 10, the article would not have been prefixed, but the pronoun *τινές*, "certain." Luke intended to mark, no doubt, a particular class of persons, the younger contradistinguished from the elder, without determining whether all or only some lent their assistance. Just as we in German (or in English) in such a case, should say: The young men in the assembly did this. But Olshausen is so far right, that if these are assumed to be regularly appointed servants of the church, they cannot be considered as the forerunners of the deacons chosen at a later period, for manifestly these *νεώτεροι* held a far lower place. I am glad to find an acute advocate of the view I have taken in Rothe; see his work on the Commencement of the Christian Church, p. 162.

† As it is by Baur in his work on Paul, p. 44.

stood to intimate that they had hitherto attended to this business without being distracted in their calling as preachers of the Word, inasmuch as the confidence universally reposed in them, and the unity pervading the church, had lightened the labor; but it assumed a very different aspect when a conflict of distinct interests arose between the members. Meanwhile, the number of the believers increased so greatly, that it is probable the apostles could not manage the distribution alone; but consigned a part of the business sometimes to one, sometimes to another, who either offered themselves for the purpose, or had shown themselves to be worthy of such confidence. But this department of labor had not yet received any regular form.

But as the visible church received into its bosom various elements, the opposition existing in these elements gradually became apparent, and threatened to destroy the Christian unity, until by the might of the Christian spirit this opposition was counterbalanced, and a higher unity developed. The strongest opposition existing in the church at this time was that between the Palestinian or purely Jewish, and the Hellenistic, or mixed Grecian and Jewish elements. And though the power of Christian love at first so fused together the dispositions of the two parties, that the contrariety seemed lost, yet the original difference soon made its appearance. It showed itself in this respect, that the Hellenists, dissatisfied with the mode of distributing the alms, were mistrustful of the others, and believed that they had cause to complain that their own poor widows were not taken such good care of in the daily distribution,* as the widows of the Palestinian Jews; whether the fact was, that the apostles had hitherto committed this business to Palestinian Jews, and these had either justly or unjustly incurred the suspicion of partiality, or whether the want of a regular plan for this business had occasioned much irregularity and neglect of individuals,† or whether the complaint was grounded more in the natural mistrust of the Hellenists than in a real grievance, must be left undetermined from the want of more exact information.‡ These complaints, however, induced the apostles to

* Neither from the expression "ministration," *διακονία*, vi. 1, nor from the phrase "to serve tables," *διακονεῖν τραπέζαις*, can it be inferred with certainty that the apostles alluded only to the distribution of food among the poor widows. We may be allowed to suppose that this was only one of the tables of the service they performed, and that it is mentioned to mark more pointedly the distinction between the oversight of spiritual, and that of secular concerns.

† As Rothe thinks in the work just alluded to, (*Die Anfänge der Christlichen Kirche*,) p. 164.

‡ Mosheim, the author of the genuine pragmatically combining method of inquiry in Church History, infers here more than can be actually proved. [The method alluded to is that which connects events together by tracing their causes and effects in the relations, characters and motives of men, and in the spirit and circumstances of the times. It is to be distinguished from that "à priori combination" and "subjective pragmatism," which arbitrarily substitute a subjective idea for an objective reality as determined by universal law, the spirit of Christianity, and Divine Revelation; and which, in order to combine events in such a way as to make them conform to a preconceived plan, find adequate cause and effect in what is purely insignificant and accidental.—ED.]

establish a regular plan for conducting this business, and since they could not themselves combine the strict oversight necessary for the satisfaction of each one's wants,* with a proper attention to the principal object of their calling, they thought it best to institute a particular office for the purpose, the first regular one for administering the concerns of the church. Accordingly, they required the church to entrust this business to persons who enjoyed the general confidence, and were fitted for the office, animated by Christian zeal, and armed with Christian prudence.† Seven such individuals were chosen; the number being accidentally fixed upon as a common one, or being adapted to seven sections of the church.

Thus this office originated in the immediate wants of the primitive church, and its special mode of operation was marked out by the peculiar situation of this first union of believers, which was in some points dissimilar to that of the Jewish synagogue, or of later churches. As it was called for by the pressure of circumstances, it certainly was not intended to be perfectly correspondent to an office in the Jewish synagogue, and can by no means be considered parallel to that of a common servant of the synagogue, (Luke iv. 20,) termed *שָׂרֵי צְדָקָה*, *שרי צדקה*.‡ It was of higher importance, for at first it was the only one in the church besides the apostolic, and required special ability in the management of men's dispositions, which might be employed in services of a higher kind, and which also without doubt belonged to the general idea of "wisdom," *σοφία*. This office, having its origin in the peculiar relations of the first church, was, therefore, not altogether identical with that which at a later period bore the same name,§ but which was subordinate to the office of presbyters; it took at that time a higher place than the office which it afterward made room for. And yet it would be wrong to deny that the later church office of this name developed itself from the first, and might be traced back to it.|| Although, as is usual in such affairs, when the ecclesiastical system became more complex, many changes took place in the office of deacons, as, for example, the management of the distribution of alms, which pertained originally to the office of deacons alone, became afterwards subject to the influence of the presbyters who assumed the whole direction of church affairs,¶ and although many other

* That they had been required to undertake the business alone, instead of entrusting it to deputies, cannot be proved from the language in the Acts.

† Acts vi. 3. The word *πνεῦμα*, "spirit," (which is the true reading, *ἁγίου*, "holy," and *κυρίου*, "of the Lord," seeming to be only glosses) denotes that inspiration for the cause of the gospel which is requisite for every kind of exertion for the kingdom of God; *σοφία* signifies that quality which is essential for this office in particular, and imports in the New Testament both wisdom and prudence.

‡ See Rothe's admirable Remarks, p. 166.

§ As Chrysostom observes in his fourteenth Homily on the Acts, § 3.

|| As the Second Trullanian Council, c. 16, which was occasioned by a special object, that the number of deacons for large towns might not be limited to seven.

¶ From Acts xi. 30, nothing more is to be inferred, than that when presbyters were

secular employments were afterwards added to this original one, yet the fundamental principle as well as the name of the office remained.* In later times, we still find traces of the distribution of alms being considered as the peculiar employment of deacons.†

Here, as in many other instances in the history of the church, human weakness and imperfection subserved the divine wisdom, and promoted the interests of the kingdom of God; for by this appointment of deacons for the Hellenistic part of the church, distinguished men of Hellenistic descent and education were brought into the public service of the church, and the Hellenists, by their freer mental culture, were in many respects better qualified rightly to understand and to publish the gospel as the foundation of a method of salvation independent of Judaism, and intended for all men equally without distinction. The important consequences resulting from this event will appear in the course of the history.

The institution of the office of presbyters was probably similar in its origin to that of deacons. As the church was continually increasing in size, the details of management also multiplied; the guidance of all its affairs by the apostles could no longer be conveniently combined with the exercise of their peculiar apostolic functions; they also wished, in accordance with the spirit of Christianity, not to govern alone, but preferred that the body of believers should govern themselves under *their* guidance; thus they divided the government of the church, which hitherto they had exercised alone, with tried men, who formed a presiding council of elders, similar to that which was known in the Jewish synagogues under the title of זְבִינִים , πρεσβύτεροι , "elders."‡ Possibly,

appointed for the general superintendence of the church, the contributions intended for the church were handed over to them, as formerly to the apostles, when they held the exclusive management of affairs. It may be fairly supposed that the presbyters entrusted each of the deacons with a sum out of the common fund for distribution in his own sphere of operation.

* I find no reason (with Rothe, p. 166) to doubt this; for the name was well adapted to denote their particular employment, and to distinguish them from persons acting in a more subordinate capacity, as "ministers," ὑπηρέται . Nor is it any objection to this that in Acts xxi. 8 they are merely called *The Seven*, for as the name of deacon was then the usual appellation of a certain class of officers in the church, Luke uses this expression to distinguish them from others of the same name, just as *The Twelve* denoted the apostles.

† Hence, at the appointment of deacons, it was required that they should "not be greedy of filthy lucre," 1 Tim. iii. 8. Origen, on Matt. t. xvi. § 22, speaks of "the deacons managing the affairs of the church," $\text{οἱ διάκονοι διοικούντες τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας χρήματα}$; and Cyprian, Ep. 55, says, of the deacon Felicissimus, that he was "a defrauder of the money committed to him," *pecuniæ commissæ sibi fraudator*. Even in the apostolic age, the deacon's office appears to have extended to many other outward employments, and most probably the word "helps," ἀντιλήψεις , denotes the serviceableness of their office. 1 Cor. xii. 28.

‡ Baur has lately maintained that the general government of the affairs of the church did not enter originally and essentially into the idea of "elders," πρεσβύτεροι , but that originally every πρεσβύτερος presided over a small, distinct, Christian society. From this, one consequence would follow, which Baur also deduces from it, that not a *republican*, but a *monarchical* element entered originally into the constitution of the church, a position which would have most important bearings in the history of the constitution of the Chris-

as the formal appointment of deacons arose from a specific outward occasion, a similar, though to us unknown, event occasioned that of presbyters. They were originally chosen as in the synagogue, not so much for the instruction and edification of the church, as for taking the lead in its general government.

But as to the provision made in the primitive church for religious instruction and edification, we have no precise information. If we are justified in assuming that the course adopted in the assemblies of Gentile Christians,*—one proceeding from the enlightened spirit and nature of Christianity, which was not confined to one station of life, or to one form of mental cultivation—was also the original one, we might from *that* conclude that, from the first, any one who had the ability and an inward call to utter his thoughts on Christian topics in a public assembly, was permitted to speak for the general improvement and edification.† But

tian church. But against this assertion we have many things to urge. Since the appointment of presbyters in the Christian churches entirely corresponded with that of presbyters in the Jewish synagogue, at least in their original constitution, so we may conclude, that if a plurality of elders stood at the head of the synagogue, the same was the case with the first Christian church. But since now the synagogue, according to the ancient Jewish constitution, was organized on the plan of the great Sanhedrim at Jerusalem, we might expect that a whole college of elders would have the direction of the synagogues, as such a college of elders was really at the head of the Jews in a city. Luke vii. 3. Only those passages in which one is distinguished by the title of "Ruler of the synagogue," ὁ ἀρχισυνάγωγος, Luke viii. 41, 49; xiii. 14, could favor the opinion that *one*, as רִבְזִי הַסִּנְגוֹגָה, stood at the head of the Jewish congregation, and that the form of government was rather monarchical. But admitting this, still the supposition of a college of presbyters, presiding over the synagogue, would not be invalidated, since we also meet with a plurality of ἀρχισυνάγωγοι = πρεσβύτεροι, Acts xiii. 15; xviii. 8, 18. Yet we must make the qualification that in smaller places an individual, as in larger towns a plurality, stood at the head of the synagogue. But it adjusts the matter, and is most probable, that although all presbyters were called ἀρχισυνάγωγοι, yet one who acted as president was distinguished by the title of ἀρχισυνάγωγος, as *primus inter pares*. In evidence of this, compare the first passage quoted from Luke with Mark v. 22. This is important in reference to the later relation of bishops to presbyters. Analogy to the Jewish synagogue, therefore, leads us to conclude, that at the head of the first church at Jerusalem a general deliberative college was placed from the beginning; an opinion favored also by a comparison with the college of apostles; and in the Acts a plurality of presbyters always actually appears next in rank to the apostles, as representatives of the church at Jerusalem. If any one is disposed to maintain that each of these presbyters presided over a smaller part of the church at its special meetings, still it must be thereby established that, notwithstanding these divided meetings, the church formed a whole, over which this deliberative college of presbyters presided, and therefore the form of government was still republican. But even if it be probable that the whole church, which could not meet in one place, divided itself into several companies, still the assumption, that from the beginning the number of presbyters was equal to the number of places of assembling and to these subdivisions of the collective body of believers, is entirely groundless, and in the highest degree improbable.

* See farther on.

† That in the Jewish-Christian churches, public speaking in their assemblies was not confined to certain authorized persons, is evident from the fact that James, in addressing believers of that class who were too apt to substitute talking for practising, censured

the first church differed from the churches subsequently formed among the Gentiles in one important respect, that in the latter there were no teachers of that degree of illumination, and possessing claim to that respect to which the apostles had a right, from the position in which Christ himself had placed them. Meanwhile, though the apostles principally attended to the advancement of Christian knowledge, and, as teachers, possessed a preponderating and distinguished influence, it by no means follows that they monopolized the right of instructing the church. In proportion as they were influenced by the spirit of the Gospel, it must have been their aim to lead believers by their teaching to that spiritual maturity, which would enable them to contribute (by virtue of the divine life communicated to all by the Holy Spirit) to their mutual awakening, instruction, and improvement. Viewing the occurrences of the day of Pentecost as an illustration of the agency of the Divine Spirit in the new dispensation, we may conclude that, on subsequent occasions, the spiritual ardor which impelled believers to testify of the divine life, was not confined to the apostles.

We find that individuals came forward, who had already devoted themselves to the study and interpretation of the Old Testament, and to meditation on divine things; and when, by the illumination of the Holy Spirit, they had become familiar with the nature of the gospel, they could with comparative ease develop and apply its truths in public addresses. They received the gift for which there was already an adaptation in their minds—the “gift of teaching,” *χάρισμα διδασκαλίας*, and, in consequence of it were, next to the apostles, fitted to give public instruction. Besides that connected intellectual development of truth, there were also addresses, which proceeded not so much from an aptness of the understanding improved by exercise, and acting with a certain uniformity of operation, as from an instantaneous, immediate, inward awakening by the power of the Holy Spirit, in which a divine afflatus was felt both by the speaker and hearers: to this class belonged the “prophecies,” the “gift of prophecy,” *προφητεῖαι, χάρισμα προφητείας*. To the prophets also were ascribed the exhortations, *παρακλήσεις*, which struck with instantaneous force the minds of the hearers.* The “teachers,” *διδάσκαλοι*, might also possess the gift of “prophecy,” *προφητεία*, but not all who uttered particular instantaneous exhortations as prophets in the church were capable of holding the office of teachers.† We have no precise information concerning the relation of the teach-

them, because so many, without an inward call, prompted by self-conceit, put themselves forward in their assemblies as teachers.

* The Levite Joses, who distinguished himself by his powerful addresses in the church, was reckoned among the prophets, and hence was called by the apostles *בָּרִיבָּרַס*, *Bar-rábas*, and this is translated in the Acts (iv. 36) *υἱὸς παρακλήσεως* — *υἱὸς προφητείας*, “son of consolation, exhortation — son of prophecy.”

† In Acts xix. 6, as a manifestation of the spiritual gifts that followed conversion, “prophesying” is put next to “speaking with tongues.”

ers to the presbyters in the primitive church, whether, in the appointment of presbyters, care was taken that only those who were furnished with the gift of teaching should be admitted into the college of presbyters. However, in all cases, the oversight of the propagation of the Christian faith—of the administration of teaching and of devotional exercises in the social meetings of believers, belonged to that general superintendence of the church which was entrusted to them; as in the Jewish synagogues, although it was not the special and exclusive office of the elders to give public exhortations, yet they exercised an inspection over those who spoke in their assemblies. Acts xiii. 15. In an epistle written towards the end of the apostolic era to an early church composed of Christians of Jewish descent in Palestine, (the Epistle to the Hebrews xiii. 7, 17,) it is presupposed that the rulers of the church had from the first provided for the delivery of divine truth, and watched over the spiritual welfare of the church, and therefore had the care of souls.*

As concerns generally the development of Christianity among the Jews, this is the *peculiar sign of its progress*: the *gradual transition* out of Judaism into Christianity as a new, independent creation; Christianity presenting itself as the crowning point of Judaism in the completeness given to it by the Messiah—the spiritualization and transfiguration of Judaism; the new, perfect law given by the Messiah coming as the fulfilment of the old, by the new spirit of the higher life imparted by the Messiah gradually developing itself in the old religious forms, to which it gave a real vitality. It is this conception of Christianity which appears in the Sermon on the Mount.† First of all, Peter comes before us, and then, after he had passed over the limits of the old national Theocracy to publish the gospel among the heathen, James appears as the representative of this first stage of development in its most perfect form.‡

The transition from Judaism to Christianity in general developed itself gradually, beginning with the acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messiah promised in the Old Testament; and hence there were formed many turbid mixtures of the Jewish religious spirit with Christianity, in which the Jewish element predominated, and the Christian principle was depressed and hindered from distinctly unfolding itself. There were many with whom faith in the Messiahship of Jesus was added to their former religious views, only as an insulated, outward fact, without developing a new principle in their inward life and disposition—baptized Jews who acknowledged Jesus as the Messiah, and expected his speedy return for the establishment of the Messianic kingdom in a temporal form, as they were wont to represent it to themselves from their carnal,

* Rothe, p. 241, has justly commented on the significance of these passages.

† See Life of Christ, p. 223, seq.

‡ See, farther on, the characteristics of James, and the development of the various types of doctrine.

Jewish stand-point; they received new precepts from Him as so many positive commands, without rightly understanding their sense and spirit, and were little distinguished in their lives from the common Jews. That Jesus faithfully observed the form of the Jewish law, was assumed by them as a proof that that form would always retain its value. They clung to the letter, the spirit was always a mystery; they could not understand in what sense he declared that he came not to destroy the law but to fulfil it. They adhered to *not destroying* it according to the letter, without understanding what was meant according to the spirit, since what was meant by *fulfilling* it was equally unknown to them. Such persons would easily fall away from the faith which had never been in them a truly living one, when they found that their carnal expectations were not fulfilled, as is implied in the language of the Epistle to the Hebrews. As the common Jewish spirit manifested itself as a one-sided attachment to externals in religion, a cleaving to the letter and outward forms without any development and appropriation of the spirit, a preference for the shell without the kernel; so it appeared in the Jews as opposed to the reception of the gospel and to the renovation of the heart by it, as an overvaluation of the outward observance of the law whether in ceremonies or in a certain outward propriety, and as an undue estimation of a merely historical faith, something external to the soul, consisting only in outward profession, either of faith in one God as creator and governor, or in Jesus as the Messiah, as if the essence of religion were placed in either one or the other, or as if a righteousness before God could be thereby obtained; it was the stand-point of a predominating outwardness of religion and religious life. The genius of the gospel had therefore to present itself in opposition to this two-fold species of religious externality, as we shall see in the sequel. At first it was the element of Pharisaic Judaism, which mingled itself with, and disturbed the pure Christian truth; at a later period Christianity aroused the attention of those mystical or theosophic tendencies which, in opposition to Pharisaism cleaving rigidly to the letter, and to a carnal Judaism had developed themselves partly, and more immediately as a reaction out of the inward religious element and spirit of Judaism, partly under the influence of Oriental and Grecian mental tendencies, by which the unbending and rugged Judaism was softened and made more flexible, though to the injury of its original theistic character; and from this quarter other erroneous mixtures with Christianity proceeded, which cramped and depressed the pure development of the Word and Spirit.

We shall now pass on from the first internal development of the Christian Church among the Jews to its outward fortunes.

CHAPTER III.

THE OUTWARD CONDITION OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH : ITS PERSECUTIONS
AND THEIR CONSEQUENCES.

It does not appear that the Pharisees, though they had taken the lead in the condemnation of Christ, were eager, after that event, to persecute his followers. They looked on the illiterate Galileans as worthy of no further attention, especially since they strictly observed the ceremonial law, and at first abstained from controverting the peculiar tenets of their party; they allowed them to remain undisturbed, like some other sects by whom their own interests were not affected. But instead of the Pharisees, the Sadducees came forward as persecutors of the Gospel which was spreading in every direction with unrestrained power. The earnestness and zeal with which the disciples testified of the Risen Saviour, and of the hope of a future Resurrection founded on him, must have rendered them hateful to this sect. A predominant negative tendency will always be suspicious and mistrustful of popular movements which proceed from a positive religious interest, and from aspirations relating to the future world; and from suspicion, it is easily roused to active hostility. And the Sadducees were noted for their harshness and inhumanity. Since they could not venture to oppugn directly and openly the doctrines of the Pharisees, they must have welcomed the opportunity of attacking, under another pretext, a sect zealous for those doctrines, and rapidly spreading, and of bringing the authority of the Sanhedrim to bear against them. But what served to render the Christians hateful to the Sadducees, must have contributed to render the Pharisees favorably disposed towards them.*

Meanwhile, the church was enabled continually to enlarge itself. An ever-increasing number were attracted and won by that irresistible spiritual power which was manifested in the primitive church; the apostles also, by miracles wrought in the confidence and power of faith, first roused the attention of carnal men, and then made use of this impression to bring them to an acknowledgment of the divine power of

* This is contrary to the opinion maintained by Dr. Baur, who, in his work on Paul, p. 34, will not allow any historical truth in the account contained in the Acts, of the persecutions excited by the Sadducees against the Christians, and calls in question generally the truth of the account respecting these early persecutions. He sees in it nothing but an *à priori* combination. "Since the discourses of the disciples," he thinks, "could contain nothing more important than the testimony to the resurrection of Jesus, no more embittered and decided opponents of it need be imagined than the Sadducees, the avowed deniers of the doctrine of a Resurrection." We must here, as in relation to other points, recognise the objective historical pragmatism which this kind of criticism would change into a subjective.

Him in whose name such wonders were performed, and to hold Him forth to them as the deliverer from all evil. Peter, especially, possessed in an extraordinary degree that gift of faith which enabled him to perform cures, of which a remarkable example is recorded in the third chapter of the Acts.

When Peter and John, at one of the usual hours of prayer, about three in the afternoon, were going into the temple, they found at one of the gates of the temple (whose precincts, as afterwards those of Christian churches, were a common resort of beggars) a man who had been lame from his birth. While he was looking for alms from them, Peter uttered the memorable words, which plainly testified to the conscious possession of a divine power that could go far beyond the common powers of man and of nature; and which, pronounced with such confidence, carried the pledge of their fulfilment: "Silver and gold have I none; but such as I have, give I thee. In the name of Jesus of Nazareth, rise up and walk." When the man, who had been universally known as a lame beggar, was seen standing with joy by the side of his two benefactors to whom he clung with overflowing gratitude, a crowd full of curiosity and astonishment collected around the apostles as they were leaving the temple, and seemed ready to pay them homage as persons of peculiar sanctity. But Peter said to them,* "Why do you look full of wonder on us, as if we had done this by our own power and holiness? It is not our work, but the work of the Holy One whom ye rejected and delivered up to the Gentiles, whose death ye demanded, though a heathen judge wished to let him go, and felt compelled to acknowledge his innocence." We here meet with the charge which ever since the day of Pentecost, Peter had been used to bring forward, in order to lead the Jews to a consciousness of their guilt, to repentance, and to faith. "God himself has by subsequent events justified Him whom ye condemned, and proved your guilt. That God who was with our fathers, and revealed his presence by miraculous events, has now revealed himself by the glorification of Him whom ye condemned. Ye have put him to death, as God had predestined in order to bestow on us a divine life of everlasting blessedness; but God raised him from the dead, and we are the eye-witnesses of his resurrection. The believing confidence implanted in our hearts by him, has effected this miracle before your eyes." Peter would have spoken in a different strain to obstinate unbelievers. But here he hoped to meet with minds open to conviction. He therefore avoided saying what would only exasperate and repel them. After he had said what tended to convince them of their guilt, he adopted a milder tone, to infuse confidence and to encourage the contrite. He brought forward what might be said in extenuation of those who had united in the condemnation of Christ, "that in ignorance they had de-

* Acts 3, 12 ff.

nied the Messiah,"* and that as far as they and their rulers had acted in ignorance, it was in consequence of a higher necessity. It was the eternal counsel of God that the Messiah should suffer for the salvation of men, as had been predicted by the prophets. But now is the time for you to prove that you have erred only through ignorance; now allow yourselves to be brought to a sense of your unrighteousness by the fact of which you are witnesses; now repent and believe in Jesus as the Messiah, and seek through him that forgiveness of your sins which he is ready to bestow. Thus only can you expect deliverance from all evil, and full salvation; for he is now hidden from your bodily eyes, and, exalted to heaven, reveals himself as invisibly efficient by miracles, such as those you have witnessed; but when the time arrives for the completion of all things, that great period to which all the prophecies of the Old Testament point from the beginning, then will he appear again on earth to effect that completion; for Moses† and the prophets have spoken beforehand of what is to be performed by the Messiah, as the consummation of all things. And you are the persons to whom these promises of the prophets will be fulfilled; to you belong the promises which God gave to your fathers, the promise given to Abraham, that through his posterity all the families of the earth should be blessed.‡ As one day a blessing from this promised seed of Abraham shall extend to all the nations of the earth,§ so shall it first be fulfilled to you, if you turn from your sins to him.||

The commotion produced among the people who gathered round the apostles in the precincts of the temple, at last aroused the attention and suspicion of the priests, whose office it was to perform the service in the

* Peter by no means acquits them of all criminality, as the connexion of his words with what he had before said plainly shows; for he had brought forward the example of Pilate to point out how great was the criminality of those who, even in their blindness, condemned Jesus; but ignorance may be more or less culpable, according to the difference of the persons.

† Peter here appeals to the passage in Deuteronomy xviii. 15, 18, where certainly according to the connexion, only the prophets in general, by whom God continually enlightened and guided his people, are contrasted with the false soothsayers and magicians of idolatrous nations. But yet, as the Messiah was the last of these promised prophets, to be followed by no other, in whom the whole prophetic system found its centre and consummation, so far this passage in its spirit may justly be applied to the Messiah; though we cannot affirm that Peter himself was distinctly aware of the difference between the right interpretation of the letter, according to grammatical and logical rules, and its application in spirit, an application certainly not arbitrary, but grounded on an historical necessity.

‡ This promise, Gen. xii. 3; xviii. 18; xxii. 18, according to its highest relation, which must be found in the organic development of the kingdom of God, is fulfilled by the Messiah.

§ On the sense in which, at that time, Peter understood this, see above, pp. 19, 20.

|| It is worthy of remark how entirely the speech of the Apostle Peter conforms to the particular development of Christianity at that period, containing nothing belonging to a later stage of development, as a speech invented by the narrator would have been likely to do.

temple, and to preserve order there. The two apostles, with the cured cripple who kept close to them, were apprehended, and as it was now evening, too late for any judicial proceedings, were put in confinement till the next day.* When brought before the Sanhe-

* Gfrörer imagines that he can show that this narrative was only a legendary echo of the accounts in the Gospels, a transference of the miracles of Christ to the apostles, and he often applies this mode of interpretation to the first part of the Acts. Thus he maintains, that the words in Acts iv. 7, "By what power and by what name have ye done this?" are copied from the question addressed to Christ, Luke xx. 2: "Tell us by what authority thou doest these things?" and that this is proved to be a false transference, because the question stands in its right place in the Gospel history, but not in the narrative of the Acts: "for, according to the Jewish notions, every one might cure diseases." But though the cure of a disease need not occasion any further inquiries, yet a cure which appeared to be accomplished by supernatural power, might properly call forth the inquiry, Whence did he who performed it profess to receive the power? The question involved, and it was so understood by Peter, an accusation that he professed to have received power for performing such things, through his connection with an individual who had been condemned by the Sanhedrim. The question was intended to call forth a confession of guilt. Equally groundless is Gfrörer's supposition, that the quotation in Acts iv. 11, "This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders," refers to Matthew xxi. 42, and can only be understood by such a reference. The connexion of the passage is sufficiently explicit, and is as follows: "If ye call us to account for the testimony we bear to Jesus as the Messiah, ye will verify what was predicted in that passage of the Psalms. The Jesus of Nazareth condemned by the heads of the Jewish polity, is honored by God to be made the foundation on which the whole kingdom of God rests. He has received from God the power by which we effect such miracles."

Gfrörer further remarks, that the plainest proof that this narrative is defective in historical truth lies in verse 16, "What shall we do to these men? for that indeed a notable miracle hath been done by them is manifest to all them that dwell in Jerusalem, and we cannot deny it;" he asserts that these persons could not have so expressed themselves. But if the author of this account has put in the mouth of the Sanhedrim what he believed might be presumed to be the thoughts that influenced their conduct, can it on that account be reasonably inferred that the narrative is in the main unhistorical? The same remark applies to Baur's objections, page 18. An exact account of what took place in the Sanhedrim we cannot indeed expect. We know, to begin with, that we have not before us a formal legal deposition. But the want of such a document can be no reason for casting doubt upon the whole transaction. Do we pronounce the historical narratives of the ancients to be untrustworthy, because the speeches they contain were composed in accordance with the sentiments of the persons to whom they are attributed? But with the ancients we recognize that art in composition which lets every one say what he might have said from his stand-point, and in his own character. In the accounts now under consideration, on the contrary, this objectivity of historical art is wanting, and where, as frequently occurs in the Acts, *original accounts*, such as are furnished by the discourses of Peter or Paul, do not form the basis, we cannot be surprised, if, in such artless narratives, the principle that was believed to animate the proceedings against the Christians should be put into the mouths of the actors as their subjective motive. Lastly, the conduct of the Sanhedrim is by no means so marked by want of discernment and of good sense as to render the narrative palpably unhistorical. From *their* stand-point the Sanhedrim could not recognize a miracle in the cure of the lame man. And yet, as they had no means at hand to explain the whole as an imposture, and to convince the people of it, they were obliged to hush up the affair, if possible, without arousing afresh, by more violent and forcible measures, the popular enthusiasm which they wished to allay. But, certainly, every plan will prove at last

drim,* Peter, full of holy inspiration, and raised by it above the fear of man, testified to the rulers of the Jewish nation that only by the might of him whom they had crucified, but whom God had raised from the dead, it had come to pass, that they beheld this man standing in perfect soundness before them.† He was the stone despised by the builders, (those who wished to be the leaders of God's people,) who had become the foundation-stone on which the whole building of God's kingdom must rest. Psalm cxviii. 22. There was no other means of obtaining salvation, but by faith in Him alone.

The members of the Sanhedrim were astonished to hear men, who had not been educated in the Jewish schools, and whom they despised as illiterate, speak with such confidence and power, and they knew not what to make of the undeniable fact, the cure of the lame man; but their prejudices and spiritual pride would not allow them to investigate more closely the cause of the fact which had taken place before their eyes. They only wished to suppress the excitement which the event had occasioned, for they could not charge any false doctrine on the apostles, who taught a strict observance of the law. Perhaps also the secret, though not altogether decided friends, whom the cause of Christ had from the first among the members of the Sanhedrim, exerted an influence in favor of the accused.‡ The schism likewise between the

to be devoid of sense, which is undertaken against a movement in men's minds founded on perfect justice and undeniable truth,—a folly which earthly rulers are still apt to repeat.

* Baur is certainly right, when in the words εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ, Acts iv. 5, he finds an implication that the members of the Sanhedrim were not all then present in Jerusalem, p. 16. But when he detects here a design on the part of the inventive historian, to insinuate how very important the affair was regarded by the authorities, we cannot agree with him. If he had written with this design he certainly would not have satisfied himself with such an intimation, but would have expressed much more strongly what he wished to be noticed. In this form of expression we see nothing more than that it was known to the reporter, who, from his proximity, was best acquainted with the events, that a part of the members of the Sanhedrim were not then residing in the city, and were perhaps scattered about the adjacent country, and that his knowledge of this circumstance unconsciously affected his phraseology. So that, on the contrary, in this little turn of expression we find a mark of originality and the absence of design.

† Baur is also disposed to see something unhistorical in the appearing of the lame man after his cure, with the two apostles, before the Sanhedrim. But whichever may have been the case, whether he was seized in company with the apostles and brought forth at the same time, or whether he appeared by the special orders of the Sanhedrim, because the *corpus delicti* related to him; in either case there is nothing improbable. The Sanhedrim, or a party in it, might have wished to try whether they could not succeed, by a personal inspection, or cross-examination of the man, to elicit something which might be turned against the apostles, or tend to allay the popular ferment. Finally, the presence of the man who was made whole, at these proceedings, is, by no means, one of those essential points with which the truth of the whole narrative stands or falls.

‡ Baur considers that, what I have here regarded as possible, and as able, perhaps, to explain the transaction, is a gross perversion of historical writing, p. 21. "Nothing can be more blamable," he says, "than an historical method which, instead of examining a matter openly, freely, and thoroughly, arbitrarily introduces fictions in the place of historical

Pharisaic and Sadducean parties in the Sanhedrim, might have had a favorable influence on the conduct of that assembly towards the Christians. Hence, without making any specific charge against the apostles, they satisfied themselves with imposing silence upon them by a peremptory mandate; which, according to the existing ecclesiastical constitution of the Jews, the Sanhedrim was competent to issue, being the highest tribunal in matters of faith, without whose sanction no one could be acknowledged as having a divine commission. The apostles protested that they could not comply with a human injunction, if it was at variance with the laws of God, and that they could not be silent respecting what they had seen and heard; the Sanhedrim, however, repeated the prohibition, and added threats of punishment in case of disobedience.

Meanwhile this miracle, so publicly wrought, the force of Peter's address, and the vain attempt to silence him by threats, had the effect of increasing the number of Christian professors to about two thousand.* As the apostles, without giving themselves any concern about the injunction of the Sanhedrim, labored according to the intention they had publicly avowed, both by word and deed for the spread of the gospel,† it is truth." But such a method I believe myself never to have been chargeable with. I have only offered this as a conjecture, to which I attach no great weight. The example of a Nicodemus, which, indeed, will find no favor at the tribunal of a criticism that is founded on a system of fictions, proves that there might be secret friends of the cause of Christ in the Sanhedrim, and in the Acts (ch. vi. 7) it is remarked that "*a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith.*" Lastly, the representation I have given of the transaction stands in no need of such a conjecture to free the narrative from the charge of internal improbability. I wish the impartial reader to decide for himself, which of us, Dr. Baur or myself, lies most open to the charge of substituting arbitrary fictions for historical truths.

* We must here notice Baur's assertion, that the numbers in the Acts appear altogether unhistorical. Baur reasons thus, p. 37: "The number of believers mentioned in Acts i. 15, (about an hundred and twenty) is manifestly false, for it contradicts the statement of the Apostle Paul, in 1 Cor. xv. 6, that Christ, after his resurrection, appeared to more than five hundred brethren at once. If this small number be manifestly incorrect, then the large numbers which afterwards occur in the Acts are not more trustworthy, and we must come to the conclusion that the small number preceded the large ones only to give a more vivid impression of the rapid and important increase of the church, which makes each class of numbers, the small and the great, equally suspicious." Even if Baur's supposition were correct, the correctness of the conclusion he draws from it is by no means evident; for of this artificial design in the use of small and large numbers, to render more illustrious by the contrast the Divine in the rapid spread of the church, I can find no trace in the simple, artless representation, nor of any of those little trickeries which Dr. Baur palms upon the author of the Acts; and I think that the natural construction of the book must make this impression upon every ingenuous and unperverted mind. But the supposition itself I cannot allow to be valid. I can see no contradiction between the account in the Acts and Paul's statement; for the reference in Acts i. 15, is not to the sum total of the whole Christian church, but merely to the number of those who were assembled in that place. Nor can I see what Baur further maintains, that the persecution raised against Stephen will not allow us to suppose that the church was so large and important, since it is by no means clear that *all the Christians* in Jerusalem must have been affected by that persecution.

† Dr. Baur charges me with a grave fault in my historical investigations—that I have

not surprising that they were soon brought again before the Sanhedrim as contumacious. When the president reproached them for their disobedience, Peter renewed his former protestation: "We must obey God rather than man. And the God of our fathers," he proceeded to say, "is he who has called us to testify concerning Him of whom ye have forbidden us to speak. By his omnipotence he has raised that Jesus whom ye crucified, and has exalted him to be the leader and redeemer of his people, that through him all may be called to repentance, and receive from him the forgiveness of their sins. This we testify, and this the Holy Spirit testifies in the hearts of those who believe on him."* These

not mentioned the wonderful deliverance of Peter from prison. He finds in the omission a failure to consistently carry out a naturalistic principle, a dishonorable concealment of difficulties. He maintains that the alternative is necessary, either to confine oneself to a simple, literally true relation, or allow historical criticism, if we believe it cannot be got rid of altogether, to exercise all its rights. Certainly, if my work had been exegetical, a Commentary on the Acts, I must necessarily have occupied myself with the examination of that special point—the opinion to be formed respecting the appearance of the angel, and Peter's wonderful release—what relation the subjective conception in the narrative of the Acts bore to the objective of the actual fact. But as an historical writer, I was justified in making a selection from the narrative, of what appeared suitable to a pragmatical object; I was nowise bound to treat every point with equal fulness. The deliverance of Peter from prison was no very important link for me in the pragmatical connection of the history. But since Dr. Baur has desired that I should express myself on this point, which I passed over in silence, I find no reason why I should not do it with the utmost frankness. I am not troubled at the reproach of partiality, nor of inconsistency, nor of indecision, nor of weakness of faith. I am not prevented by *a priori* grounds from admitting the angelic appearance; but the account is not sufficiently definite and exact to accredit such a fact, and in the words of Peter, spoken before the Sanhedrim, no allusion to such a release is found. But if I acknowledge a break in the historical connection of this occurrence, and some alloy mixed with the purely historical, it by no means follows that there is no historical truth at the basis, and still less that everything related in the Acts was fabricated with a design to magnify the apostles. This I cannot admit even in the particular case where I acknowledge a mixture of the unhistorical. I would rather say, that the fact of a release by a special divine guidance, to us unknown, became involuntarily transferred into the appearance of an angel of the Lord, who freed Peter from prison. As to the alternative laid down by Dr. Baur, I admit it, and avow that criticism must be granted its full right in these investigations. But in the way Dr. Baur applies it, I cannot recognise its full right, but only an arbitrariness against which, in accordance with my convictions of the duty of an historical inquirer, I must declare myself, in its application not only to this, but to any other historical question. This criticism, professedly so free from assumption, proceeds on assumptions which I must reject as unfounded; and hence the opposition which exists between our modes of treating the history of Christianity.

* These words (Acts v. 32) are by many understood, as if by the expression "that obey," *πειθοῦντες*, the apostles were intended, and as if the sense of the passage were this: We testify of these things, as the eye-witnesses chosen by Him; and the Holy Spirit, in whose power we have performed this cure, testifies by the works which we accomplish in his name. Such an interpretation is certainly possible. But it is more natural, as we apply the first clause to the apostles, to apply the second to those who received their message in faith, and to whom the truth of this message was verified, independently of their human testimony, by the divine witness of the Holy Spirit in their hearts; to whom the Holy Spirit himself gave a pledge that, by faith in Jesus, they had received forgive-

words of Peter at once aroused the wrath of the Sadducees and Fanatics, and many of them were clamorous for putting the apostles to death; but amidst the throng of infuriated zealots, *one* voice of temperate wisdom might be heard. Gamaliel,* one of the seven most distinguished teachers of the Law, (the Rabbanim,) thus addressed the members of the Sanhedrim: "Consider well what ye do to these men. Many founders of sects and party-leaders have appeared in our day; they have at first acquired great notoriety, but in a short time they and their cause have come to nothing." He proved his assertion by several examples of commotions and insurrections which happened about that period among the Jews.†

ness of sins and a divine life. This interpretation is also to be preferred, because Peter, after the day of Pentecost, was always wont to appeal to that objective testimony which the Holy Spirit produced in all believers. If the first interpretation were correct, since the emphasis would lie on *ἡμεῖς*, "we," and the Holy Spirit by us, the last clause should accordingly have been *ἡμῖν τοῖς πειθαρχοῦσιν*, "to us who obey."

* Baur, in p. 35 of his work above referred to, considers the introduction of Gamaliel as somewhat unhistorical, and the words ascribed to him as a fabrication. What was really historical (he declares) could only amount to this, that at that time the view prevailed among the rulers of the Jews that it might be best to leave the cause of Jesus to its own fate, in the certain presumption that in a short time it would be seen how little there was in it; and on this presumption the speech was framed which the historian puts into the mouth of Gamaliel. But we find nothing at all which can justify such a recasting of history. The speech ascribed to Gamaliel is so characteristic and individual, that we are the less inclined to call in question the fact that it was actually spoken, and spoken by Gamaliel. It perfectly suits the position which this teacher of the law, as he is represented in the text, occupied among the Jews. The man who could form an intelligent judgment of Grecian literature, was also capable of rising to this higher historical standpoint in his judgment of Christianity. That Paul, who was at first animated by a fanatical fury against Christianity, proceeded from his school, is no argument to the contrary; for it is allowed how little right we have to judge of teachers by their scholars. Let it be recollected, too, that this was before Stephen made his appearance, which placed Christianity in a far more odious light to the party of the Pharisees. And if the mention of the example of Theudas is an anachronism, which did not proceed from Gamaliel, yet it by no means follows that the text, the leading idea of the speech, did not come from him. The characteristic opening words of Gamaliel, by the sharp impress they bear, might easily be amplified, and it would be very natural that Gamaliel should appeal to examples from history in support of his advice. This is what we consider as certain. Baur maintains that if the narrative in the Acts of what had preceded these transactions in the Sanhedrim be correct, Gamaliel could not have uttered such words; for history, to the evidence of which he appealed, would have already determined the question. Here, then, is the dilemma, either Gamaliel did not utter this, or all which is here told of the miracles of the apostles, and the extension of the Christian church, did not really take place. But we cannot acknowledge the correctness of this dilemma. No external evidence is sufficient to effect in man a complete change of his religious and intellectual convictions. Although the power with which Christianity diffused itself, and what he had learned of the wonderful cures performed by the apostles, would strike Gamaliel with astonishment, yet they were not sufficient to lead him to acknowledge Jesus as the Messiah, and to that point he must have come already, if the evidence of history had been all that was needful to decide the question for him.

† The mention of Theudas in Gamaliel's speech, occasions, as is well known, a great difficulty, since his insurrection seems as if it could be no other than that mentioned by

They might safely leave this affair also to itself. If of human origin, it would speedily come to an end; but if it should be something divine, vain would be the attempt to put it down by human power, and let them see to it, that they were not guilty of rebellion against God.

Too much has been attributed to these words of Gamaliel, when it has been inferred from them that he was a secret adherent of the gospel;* the connection he kept up with the Jewish schools of theology precludes such a supposition. By the traditions of the Gemara we are justified in considering him one of the freethinking Jewish theologians, as we also learn from his being in favor of the cultivation of Grecian literature;† and from his peculiar mental constitution we might likewise infer, that he could be easily moved by an impression of the divine, even in appearances which did not bear the stamp of his party. Many of his expressions, which are preserved in the Mishna, mark him plainly enough to have been a strict Pharisee, as he is described by his pupil Paul; the great respect, too, in which he has ever been held by the Jews is a sufficient proof that they never doubted the soundness of his creed, that he could not be accused of any suspicious connection with the heretical sect. On the one hand, he had a clear perception of the fact, that all fanatical movements are generally rendered more violent by opposition, and that what in itself is insignificant, is often raised into importance by forcible attempts to suppress it. On the other hand, the manner in which the apostles spoke and acted must have made some impression on a man not wholly prejudiced; while their exact observance of the law, and hostile attitude towards Sadduceeism, must have disposed him more strongly in their favor, and hence the thought might have arisen in his mind that, after all, there was perhaps something divine in the cause they advocated. His counsel prevailed; no heavier punishment than scourging was inflicted on the apostles for their disobedience, and they were dismissed after the former prohibition had been repeated.

Up to this time the members of the new sect, being strict observers of the law, and agreeing with the Pharisees in their opposition to the Sadducees, appeared in a favorable light to at least the moderate of the

Josephus, Antiq. xx. 5, 1; but to admit this would involve an anachronism. It is very possible that, at different times, two persons named Theudas raised a sedition among the Jews, as the name was by no means uncommon. Origen (against Celsus, i. 57) mentions a Theudas before the birth of Christ, but his testimony is not of great weight, for perhaps he fixed the time by the account in the Acts. It is also possible that Luke, in the relation of the event which he had before him, found the example of Theudas adduced as something analogous, or that one name has happened to be substituted for another. In either case it is of little importance.

* In the Clementines, i. 65, on the principle of *fraus pia*, it is supposed that, by the advice of the apostles, he remained a member of the Sanhedrim, and concealed his real faith in order to act for the advantage of the Christians, and to give them secret information of all the designs formed against them.

† See Jost's History of the Israelites, vol. iii. p. 170.

former.* But this amicable relation was at an end as soon as they came, or threatened to come, into open conflict with the principles of Pharisaism itself, as soon as the spirit of the new doctrine was felt to be more distinctly antagonistic—an effect produced by an individual, memorable on this account in the early annals of Christianity, the proto-martyr Stephen.

The deacons, as we have already remarked, were primarily appointed for a secular object, but in the discharge of their special duty they frequently came in contact with home and foreign Jews; and since men had been chosen for this office who were full of Christian zeal, full of Christian faith, and full of Christian wisdom and prudence, they possessed both the inward call and the ability to make use of these numerous opportunities for the spread of the gospel among the Jews. In these attempts Stephen particularly distinguished himself. As a man of Hellenistic descent and education, he was better fitted than a native of Palestine to enter into the views of those foreign Jews who had synagogues for their exclusive use at Jerusalem, and thus to lead them to receive the gospel. The Holy Spirit, who hitherto had employed as instruments for the spread of the gospel, only Palestinian Jews, now fitted for his service an individual of very different culture, the Hellenistic Stephen; and the result of this choice was very important.

Although what we say is disputed by persons occupying two opposite stand-points—those who in a rude and lifeless manner advocate the supernatural in Christianity, and those who deny everything supernatural,—yet we cannot give up an idea which is of importance in relation to the development of Christianity from the beginning, namely, that the supernatural and the natural, the Divine and the human, always work together in harmony.

Although the Holy Spirit alone, according to the Saviour's promise, could lead the apostles to a clear perception of the contents of the whole truth† announced by himself; yet the quicker or slower development of this perception was in many respects dependent on the mental peculiarity and the special results of the general and religious culture, of the individuals who were thus to be enlightened by the Holy Spirit. In one individual the development of Christian consciousness was prepared for by his previous stand-point; and hence, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, a knowledge (*γνῶσις*) of Christian truth rapidly developed itself from faith (*πίστις*); whereas, for another to attain the same insight, the bounds which confined his previous stand-point must be first broken down by the power of the Holy Spirit operating in a more immediate manner, by a new additional revelation (*ἀποκάλυψις*). Thus we perceive how the mixing of the theocratic element, which had served for the

* See Schneckenburger's Essay in his *Beiträgen zur Einleitung in's Neue Testament*, p. 87.

† Christ did not promise the apostles indefinitely that the Holy Spirit should guide them into all things, but into the whole of the truth, which he came to announce for the salvation of mankind. John xvi. 13. See *Life of Christ*, p. 400.

development of the Hebrew nation, with Grecian culture, must have served to prepare the way for understanding the truth revealed by Christ; for thus the coarse and narrow Jewish spirit was refined and expanded, so that it could follow more easily the development of Christian truth when it broke through the limits of Jewish nationality.

When Christ spoke to his apostles of certain things which they could not yet comprehend, but which must be first revealed to them by the Holy Spirit, he, no doubt, referred to the nature of that worship of God which is not necessarily confined to place or time, or to any kind whatever of outward observances—the worship in spirit and in truth, with which the abolition of the Mosaic ceremonial law (that wall of separation between the chosen people of God and other nations, Eph. ii. 14), and the union of all nations in one spiritual worship and one faith, were closely connected. The apostles, doubtless, had by this time understood, through the illumination of the Holy Spirit, the nature of the spiritual worship founded on faith; but the consequences flowing from it in relation to outward Judaism they had not yet clearly apprehended. In this respect, their stand-point resembled Luther's after he had attained a living faith in justification, in reference to outward Catholicism, ere he had, by the further maturing of his Christian knowledge, abjured that also; and that of many who before and since the Reformation have attained to vital Christianity, though still to a degree enthralled in the fetters of Catholicism. Thus the Christian consciousness of the apostles could not be developed into a clear perception of the truth in this respect, till by the power of the Holy Spirit they had been freed from the fetters of their strictly Jewish training. On the other hand, the Hellenistic Stephen needed not to attain this mental freedom by a new immediate operation of the Holy Spirit, for he was already, by his early development in Hellenistic culture, more free from these fetters; he was not so much entangled in Jewish nationality; and hence his faith could in this respect be more readily developed into Christian knowledge, and he could more easily and quickly attain to the apprehension of that which is grounded in the nature of Christian truth, and is intimated in single expressions of Christ.

If there had been given to us a pragmatic historical narrative of these facts, after the manner of the classic historians of antiquity, presenting everything in its genetic development, and distinguishing the various forces in actions and events, we might be able to determine more exactly the position which Stephen occupied,—his relation to Paul in the development of Christianity. But since the accounts in the Acts are not of this sort, and contain many gaps, nothing is left for us but to adopt that divining and combining process, by which many passages in history have first been placed in their true light; which can find in fragments a whole, and, where only effects are presented to the eye, can educe and lay open their principles and causes. Stephen disputed much, as we are expressly told in ch. vi. 9, with the foreign Hellenistic Jews,

and we may justly assume that the acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messiah, and of his work as truly Messianic, formed the subject of these disputations—that Stephen used the Old Testament to lead the Hellenistic Jews to this acknowledgment, and that consequently these disputations would relate to the exposition of the Old Testament. Great irritation was excited against Stephen, such as had never till that time been called forth on the question whether Jesus was the Messiah. The Sanhedrim had believed that it was necessary to check the spread of the new sect; but of an upstir among the people in relation to it, no trace had yet been seen; something new, therefore, must have intervened by which the acknowledgement of the Messiahship of Jesus had become so offensive to those who adhered to the established religion. And this supposition is confirmed by the charge brought against Stephen by the parties who were thus irritated: “We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses and against God,” Acts vi. 11. Now for the first time since Christ personally had ceased to be the object of the attacks of the Pharisaic party, was such an accusation heard against a Christian; for hitherto the believers, agreeing with the Pharisees in the strict observance of the Mosaic Law, had given occasion for no such charge. Evidently, it was not the acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messiah, but the manner in which Stephen spoke of the Messianic work of Jesus, and of the effects that would be produced by Christianity, that was the occasion of this charge of heresy. The charge of uttering blasphemy against Moses would lead us to infer that Stephen was the first who presented the Gospel in opposition to the Mosaic Law, and had spoken against its justifying power and perpetual validity; and this, to the Jews, who made all justification and sanctification to depend on the law, and believed in its indefeasible validity, must have appeared as blaspheming the divine authority of Moses. It would also appear to them as blasphemy against God, in whose name, and as whose ambassador, Moses appeared, and who had promised an ever-enduring validity to his law. Stephen, we may presume, as Paul at a later period, endeavored to prove from the prophetic passages of the Old Testament, that too much was ascribed to the law from the ordinary Jewish standpoint, and that the Old Testament itself pointed to a higher position, to which it was only preparatory. This view is confirmed by the charge brought by the Sanhedrim against Stephen, which we shall notice presently. The whole religious cultus of the Old Testament is founded on the principle that religion was held within the bounds of space and time, and must necessarily be connected with certain places and times. The controversy against an over-valuation of the law must hence have led Stephen to controvert an over-valuation of the temple. By him it was first confessed and proclaimed, that a perfectly new stand-point in the development of the kingdom of God was to be created by Christ—a purely spiritual worship embracing the whole life of which faith in its founder would be at once the foundation and centre. He referred, prob-

ably, to the expressions of Christ which related to the impending destruction of the Temple at Jerusalem, and the founding a new one by Himself, as well as to other intimations of that universal transformation which should proceed from the words spoken through Him, since with the Temple the whole form of the Old Testament cultus must come to an end. But if our supposition be correct, how can we consider that the charge brought against Stephen deserved to be called a false one? In the same sense in which it might be afterwards said of Paul, that his enemies unjustly accused him of blasphemy against Moses, against the Temple of the God of the Old Testament. While Stephen was convinced that, taking into account the ultimate aim of the Old Testament development, he only honored the Old Testament and God as therein revealed, he was charged with an inimical design; and since his opponents understood in a different sense what he said, from what he intended, he could, in this respect, designate their accusation as false. Moreover, it is possible, that the materials which the author of the Acts made use of in this part of his narrative, proceeded from a person who could not comprehend the position to which Stephen was elevated, and hence could not distinguish Stephen's real meaning from what his enemies charged him with. Stephen's defense* would also have taken quite a different form, if he could have explained the charges brought against him as entirely founded on misapprehension—if he had not acknowledged a portion of truth as the ground-work which he could not retract, but was on the contrary prepared to maintain with earnestness. After this preliminary justification we proceed with the narrative.

Stephen was the forerunner of the great Paul, in his perception of Christian truth and the testimony he bore to it, as well as in his conflict for it with the carnal Jews, who obstinately adhered to their ancient conceptions.† It is highly probable that he was first led by his dispu-

* But here the question arises whether we have the discourse of Stephen in all essential points as it was spoken, or a production of the author of the Acts fitted to a preconceived plan. The latter is advocated by Baur. But we must maintain that if the author of the Acts had been so skilled in historic art as to be able to transport himself to Stephen's stand-point, and to invent such a discourse in his style and character, his own historical composition would have been altogether different. He would, from the first, have drawn a clearer representation of the man, and of his importance in relation to the subsequent development of Christianity, which would have rendered it needless for us to attempt it by means of a conjectural combination. The manner in which these things are narrated, stands in the most striking contrast to that artistical dexterity which is presupposed in the invention of such a discourse. Certainly it cannot be supposed that if a writer had wished to represent in the person of Stephen, the collision that then first took place between the spiritual worship of Christianity and the stand-point of the Jewish cultus still involved in carnality, he would so have concealed his real design, that it would only be apparent at the end. A plan so artificial and carefully adjusted could hardly have been undertaken by a Christian of that primitive age.

† To which Baur of Tübingen has properly drawn attention in his acute and spirited Weihnachtsprogramm of the year 1829: *De Orationis habitæ a Stephano Act. c. vii. consilio*. While I recognize a divine, objective historical pragmatism in the relation to

tations with the Hellenists, to present the gospel on the side of its opposition to the Mosaic law; to combat the belief in the necessity of that law for the justification and sanctification of men, and, what was connected therewith, its perpetual obligation, and then to show that the new spirit of the gospel freed it altogether from the outward forms of Judaism; that the new spirit of religion required an entirely new form. As, agreeably to the prophecy of Christ, the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem, with which the Jews had hitherto considered the worship of God as necessarily and essentially connected, was now about to take place by means of the divine judgments on the degenerate earthly kingdom of God, through the victorious divine power of the Messiah, exalted to the right hand of his heavenly Father—so would the whole outward system of Judaism fall with this its only earthly sanctuary, and the Theocracy arise glorified and spiritualized from its earthly trammels. We cannot determine with confidence, to what extent Stephen, in his disputations with the Jews, developed all this, but we may infer with certainty from the consequences, that it was more or less explicitly stated by this enlightened man. Hence it came to pass, that the rage of the Pharisees was now excited, as it had never yet been, against the promulgators of the new doctrine; hence an accusation such as had never yet been brought against them—that Stephen had uttered blasphemous words against Jehovah and against Moses. We are told, indeed, that *false* witnesses deposed against him that he ceased not to speak against the Holy Place (the temple) and the Law—that he had declared that Jesus of Nazareth would destroy the temple and abrogate the usages handed down from Moses. But although these accusations are represented as the depositions of *false* witnesses, it does not follow, that all that they said was a fabrication, but only that they had, on many points, distorted the assertions of Stephen, with an evil intention. They accused him of attacking the divine origin and holiness of the law, and of blaspheming Moses; all which was very far from his design. Yet he must, by what he said, have given them some occasion for their misrepresentations, for before this time, nothing similar had been brought against the publishers of the gospel; hence we may make use of their allegations to find out what

each other, of these two champions of the Christian faith, and thank Dr. Baur who, perhaps, first drew my attention to it, I cannot, on the other hand, agree with Dr. Schneckenburger, who thinks he has detected a subjective pragmatism purposely framed by Luke. In the simple representation given by Luke from the single accounts lying before him, I cannot discover any direct intention to exhibit Stephen in his public character and in his disputations with the Jews as a prototype of Paul. (See Schneckenburger's treatise on the Object of the Acts: Bern, 1841: pp. 172, 184.) If such had really been his design, it would, I think, have been more strongly marked, after the manner of his times. Indeed, this whole historic view of the apologetic aim of Luke, as a partisan of Paul, in opposition to the Petrine party, is too artificially made out from the book, and too little supported by the author's own words, for me to favor the hypothesis.

Stephen really said.* And his defence plainly indicates that he by no means intended to repel the accusation as altogether a falsity, but rather to acknowledge that there was truth mixed up with it; that what he had really spoken, and what was already so obnoxious to the Jews, he had no wish to deny, but only to develop and establish it in its right connection. Only thus we gain the true point of view for understanding this memorable and often misunderstood speech.

Stephen was seized by his embittered enemies, brought before the Sanhedrim, and accused of blasphemy.† But those not altogether unus-

* Baur properly compares this with what the false witnesses said against Christ (Matt. xxvi. 61.) See "Life of Christ," p. 171. But when Baur, in his book on Paul, p. 56, would find in it no historical truth, but only a designed imitation of the history of Christ, transferring to Stephen what in Matt. xxvi. 60, is said of Christ, we cannot grant our approval. We can discover no trace of such a design. "But," says Baur, "since false witnesses appeared against Jesus with the same accusation, so false witnesses must not be wanting here; as little as it may appear how their testimony could have been only false." But there is no contradiction in this, that an accusation may be false in the sense in which it is put forth by those who make use of it, and yet a truth lie at its basis. But that the author of the Acts has not distinguished and developed more clearly in what sense the accusation may have been false, and in what sense it contained truth, instead of exhibiting design, shows rather the want of historical skill and of a development conformed to a pre-conceived plan.

† Baur is disposed to find in the whole progress of this transaction, something unhistorical. How can it be supposed, he says, that Stephen would be accused in this tumultuous manner by the Sanhedrim, who listened to him at first so quietly, but then are described as all at once breaking out upon him with such fury? This tribunal would have compromised its dignity, and by such an extra judicial infliction of death, have exposed itself to the heaviest responsibility before the Roman governor. As no consistent notion of such an act of the Sanhedrim can be formed, it is far more probable, that everything proceeded only from a tumultuary movement of the people, who seized Stephen in their fanatical excitement, and dragged him forth to be stoned. But since the author of the Acts wished to give the transaction great importance, to represent in Stephen the image of Christ, since he wished him to deliver a discourse, he must bring him before the Sanhedrim, and he must, however improbable it may be, let them take part in the tumultuous proceedings against him. We grant, that in the description given in the Acts there is a want of clearness and luminousness in particular points, but this can decide nothing against the credibility of the whole. Although we should not dispute very strongly whether Stephen were sacrificed to popular fury, or appeared before the Sanhedrim itself, still we find a pledge for the latter in this: that the discourse handed down to us bears the impress of one actually delivered, and presupposes such a tribunal before which it was delivered. We may suppose that the fanatical Jews dragged Stephen before the Sanhedrim just assembled, or that the Sanhedrim was assembled for the examination of this charge; for we are surely not justified in admitting, that everything that is narrated in the acts respecting Stephen happened in one day. Now, hitherto, no occasion had been found to accuse the Christians of apostasy from Judaism; nothing was known of them, which could make that accusation credible. It might, therefore, happen that the better members of the Pharisaic party in the Sanhedrim were not really prejudiced against Stephen. When he appeared before them, the Divine, which expressed itself in his whole appearance, at first made an impression that commanded the regard of a part of the assembly; and then the manner in which he began to speak of the dealings of God with their forefathers was suited to testify to his piety, to counterwork the accusations brought against him, and to dispose his hearers in his favor. Also, though we who have the whole

ceptible in the assembly were unfitted by the divine expression of his whole appearance, by his inspired confidence, by the heavenly repose and serenity which beamed in all his features, to see in him a blasphemer of God. When in the Acts we are told, that he stood before them with a glorified countenance, "as it were the face of an angel," either many members of the Sanhedrim had themselves thus described the impression which his appearance at first made upon them, or the author of the narrative has, according to his own view and in his own language, transmitted what had been related to him concerning the profound impression made by the personal presence of the persecuted disciple; in no case can we be justified in declaring his whole account to have had a merely subjective origin. The topics and arrangement of Stephen's discourse were suited to confirm this impression, and to turn it to good account, to fix the attention of his judges, and to put their minds in a more favorable position towards the speaker, thus gradually preparing them for that which he wished to make the main subject of his discourse. That discourse perfectly corresponds with the leading qualities ascribed to his character in the Acts. In his frank manner of expressing what he had learned by the light of the Divine Spirit, we recognize the man full of the power of faith, without the fear of man, or deference to human opinion; in his manner of constantly keeping one end in view, and yet, instead of abruptly urging it, gradually preparing his hearers for it, we recognize the man full of Christian prudence.

The object of Stephen's discourse was not simple but complex; yet its different aims stood in most intimate connection with each other. Its primary object was certainly apologetical, but as he forgot himself in the subject with which he was inspired, his apologetic efforts relate rather to the truths maintained by him and impugned by his adversaries, than to himself.* Hence, not satisfied with defending, he developed and enforced the truths he had proclaimed; and at the same time, condemned the carnal ungodly temper of the Jews, which was little disposed to receive the truth. Thus with the apologetic element, the didactic and polemic were combined. Stephen first refutes the charges made against him of enmity against the people of God, of contempt of their sacred institutions, and of blaspheming Moses. He traces the procedure of the divine providence, in guiding the people of God from the times of their progenitors; he notices the promises and their progressive fulfilment, to

discourse before us know what its aim was from the beginning, yet it is not clear that his hearers could so soon apprehend it. And this serves to explain how it could happen that they heard Stephen patiently, till he came to the words in which his Christian feeling expressed itself so powerfully and unreservedly, regardless of consequences. Here fanatical fury broke forth; they would not listen any longer to his blasphemies. He was dragged out, and now the punishment began which the infuriated people inflicted on him. Thus in a just representation of the connection of these transactions, we find nothing which justifies the denial of their historical truth.

* See on this point the excellent remarks of Baur, p. 48, in the treatise already alluded to.

the end of all the promises, the end of the whole development of the Theocracy—the advent of the Messiah, and the work to be accomplished by him. But with this narrative he blends his charges against the Jewish nation. He shows that their ingratitude and unbelief, proceeding from a carnal mind, became more flagrant in proportion as the promises were fulfilled, or given with greater fulness; and their conduct in the various preceding periods of the development of God's kingdom, was a specimen of the disposition they now evinced towards the publication of the gospel.* The first promise which God made to the patriarchs, was that respecting the land which he would give to their posterity for a possession, where they were to worship him.

In faith the patriarchs went forth under the constant guidance of God himself, which, however, did not bring them to the fulfilment of the promise. This promise was brought to the eve of its accomplishment by Moses. His divine call, the miracles God wrought for him and by him, are especially brought forward, and likewise the conduct of the Jews while under his guidance, as unbelieving, ungrateful and rebellious towards this highly accredited servant of God, through whom they had received such great benefits: and yet Moses was not the end of the divine revelation. His calling was to point to that prophet whom God would raise up after him, whom they were to obey like himself. The conduct of the Jews towards Moses is therefore a type of their conduct towards that last great prophet whom he announced and prefigured. The Jews gave themselves up to idolatry, when God first established among them by Moses a symbolical sanctuary for his worship. This sanctuary was in the strictest sense of divine origin. Moses superintended its erection according to the pattern shown to him by God, in a symbolic higher manifestation.† The sanctuary was a movable one, till at last Solomon was permitted to erect an abiding edifice for divine worship on a similar plan. With this historical survey, Stephen concludes his argument against the superstitious reverence for the temple felt by the carnally-minded Jews, against their narrow-hearted sensuous tendency to confine the essence of religion to the temple-worship. Having expressed this in the words of the prophet Isaiah, it was a natural transi-

* In this species of polemical discussion, Stephen was a forerunner of Paul. De Wette justly notices, as a peculiarity of the Hebrew nation, that conscience was more alive among them than any other people; often, indeed, an accusing conscience, the feeling of guilt, the feeling of a high office assigned to them from which they cannot, though they would, be released, the feeling of a schism between knowledge (the law) and the will, so that sin accumulates and comes distinctly into view; Rom. v. 20. See "*Studien und Kritiken*," 1837, 4th No., p. 1003. On this account, the history of the Hebrew nation is the type of the history of the race and of men individually.

† Stephen had, perhaps, two distinct aims in mind, to intimate, on the one hand, that it was necessary, in order to guard against idolatry to which the Jews were so prone, to confine the worship of God to a fixed visible sanctuary, and, on the other hand, that this sanctuary could not communicate the divine, but could only represent it in a figure, an idea which pervades the Epistle to the Hebrews.

tion to speak of the essential nature of true spiritual worship, and of the prophets who in opposition to the stiff-necked, carnal dispositions of the Jews, had testified concerning it, and the Messiah by whom it was to be established among the whole human race. A vast prospect now opened before him; but he could not complete the grand picture of the theocratic development, nor proceed even to the limits he had proposed;* while contemplating it, the emotions it excited carried him away; his holy indignation gushed forth in a torrent of rebuke against the ungodly, unbelieving, hypocritical disposition of the Jews, whose conduct in reference to the divine communications had been the same from the time of Moses up to that very moment. “Ye stiff-necked, although boasting of your circumcision, yet who have never received the true circumcision, ye uncircumcised in heart and ear (who want the disposition to feel and to understand what is divine), ye always withstand the workings of the Holy Ghost. Ye do as your fathers did. As your fathers murdered the prophets who predicted the appearance of the Holy One, so have ye yourselves given Him up to the Gentiles, and thus are become his murderers. Ye who boast of a law given by God through the ministry of angels,† (as organs of making known the divine will,) and yet are so little observant of this law!”

Till this rebuke was uttered, Stephen had been quietly heard. But as soon as they perceived the drift of his discourse, their blind zeal and spiritual pride were roused. He observed the symptoms of their rage, but instead of being terrified thereby, he looked up to heaven, full of believing confidence in the power of Him of whom he testified, and saw with a prophetic glance, in opposition to the machinations of men against the cause of God, the glorified Messiah, denied by these men, but exalted to heaven, armed with divine power, and about to conquer all who dared to oppose his kingdom. This prophetic view was presented to him in the form of a symbolic vision. As he looked up to heaven it appeared to open before his eyes. In more than earthly splendor, there appeared to him a form of divine majesty; he beheld Christ (whose glorious image was probably present to him from actual early recollection) glorified and enthroned at the right hand of God. Already in spirit raised to heaven, he testified with full confidence of what he beheld. In all periods of the

* We must certainly maintain against Baur that Stephen's discourse is left unfinished, that he could not complete the plan he had proposed; that just when he had reached the principal point, for which all that went before was preparatory, he was interrupted; unless, perhaps, the discourse as we have received it, is imperfectly reported.

† This was confessedly a frequent mode among the Jews of marking the superhuman origin of the law; so that, according to Josephus, Herod, in a speech to the Jewish army, made use of this universally acknowledged fact, that the Jews had received their law from God through angels, (*δι' ἀγγέλων παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ μαθόντων*), in order to show how holy the ambassadors sent to them must be, who filled the same office as that of the angels between God and men; *ἄγγελοι*=*πρέσβεις*, *κήρυκες*, angels=ambassadors, heralds. Joseph. Antiq. xv. 5, 3. We shall refer to the varied application of this idea in the section on Doctrine.

church, a blind zeal for adherence to the letter and ceremonial services has been wont to interpret a highly spiritual state, which will not follow the rules of the reigning theological school, nor suffer itself to be confined by ancient dogmas, as mere fanaticism or blasphemy;* and so it was on this occasion. The members of the Sanhedrim stopped their ears, that they might not be defiled by his blasphemies. They threw themselves on Stephen, and dragged him out of the city in order to stone him as a blasphemer. It was sentence and execution all at once; an act of violence without regular judicial examination; especially as according to the existing laws, the Sanhedrim could decide only on disciplinary punishment, but was not allowed to execute a capital sentence without the concurrence of the Roman governor.† With the same confidence with which Stephen, amidst the rage and fury of his enemies, saw the Saviour of whom he testified, ruling victorious—with the same confidence he directed his eyes towards him in the prospect of death, and said, “Lord Jesus, receive my spirit!”‡ And as he had only Him before his eyes, it was his Spirit which led him to adopt the Saviour’s last words, thus making him a pattern in death, as he had been in life. He who, when carried away with holy zeal for the cause of God, had so emphatically censured the baseness of the Jews, now that their fury attacked his own person, prayed only that their sins might be forgiven.

Thus we see in the death of Stephen the new development of Christian truth apparently stopped; he died a martyr, not only for the truth of the gospel in general, but in particular for this freer and wider application of it, which began with him and seemed to expire with him. Yet from the beginning it has been the law of the development of the Christian life, and will continue to be down to the last glorious result, which shall consummate the whole with the final triumph over death—*that out of death a new life comes forth, and martyrdom for the divine truth, both in its general and particular forms, prepares for its victory.* Such was the issue here. This first new development of evangelical truth had to be checked in the germ in order to shoot forth with greater vigor, and to a wider extent, in the person of Paul; and the martyrdom of Stephen was

* Thus, at the Council of Constance, it was condemned as a violation of ecclesiastical subordination, that Huss had dared to appeal to Christ.

† See Life of Christ, p. 412.

‡ I can find no reason whatever for recognising (as Baur has done) in Stephen’s manner of speaking and acting, instead of the image of Christ as impressed by his Spirit on his genuine disciples, nothing but the impress of the subjective fiction which makes Stephen a copy of Christ. To support the latter view, it is urged that such words as Stephen used occur in Luke xxiii. 34 and 46, and that this agreement could not be merely accidental, but points to one source. But I do not perceive that the literal agreement which exists here, can only be so explained, since it may be very naturally accounted for on the ground that the Spirit of Christ, which expressed itself in the words of Christ transmitted to us by Luke, caused Stephen to express himself in the same way. That false testimony against Christ, of which (Baur would have us believe) the false testimony against Stephen is an imitation, does not in so many words appear in Luke.

a necessary step in the process. If this new development had been fully exhibited at this time, the other publishers of the gospel would have been found unprepared for it, and not yet capable of receiving it. But in the meantime, these persons, by a variety of concurrent circumstances, were to be prepared in a natural way, under the constant guidance of the Holy Spirit, for this deeper insight into the truth.

The martyrdom of Stephen was important in its direct effects for the spreading of the faith, since it might be expected that, under the immediate impression made by the sight of such a witness, and of such a death, many minds not altogether unsusceptible, nor altogether deluded by the power of error, would be led to the faith; but yet the indirect consequences were still more important, by which the third violent persecution was raised against the new church at Jerusalem. This persecution must have been more severe and extensive than the former; for by the manner in which Stephen entered into conflict with Pharisaism, he had roused to hostility against the teachers of the new doctrine the sect of the Pharisees, who had the most credit with the common people, and were powerful and active, and ready to leave no means untried to attain their object whatever it might be. The persecution proceeding from this quarter would naturally mark as its special victims those who were colleagues in office with Stephen as deacons, and who resembled him in their Hellenistic origin and education. It was, however, the occasion of spreading the gospel beyond the bounds of Jerusalem and Judea, and even among the Gentiles. With this progressive outward development of the gospel was also connected its progressive inward development, the consciousness of the independence and intrinsic capability of Christianity as a doctrine destined without foreign aid to impart divine life and salvation to all men, among all nations without distinction. As we have frequently seen that the hostilities waged against a truth when first brought to light, with which its publishers have had to contend, have very much contributed to render their consciousness of it more clear and complete, and to make them better acquainted with the consequences that flow from it,—so here also the opposition of Pharisaical Judaism must have had a powerful and beneficial influence in developing freer views of the Gospel among the Hellenists.

Here, then, we stand on the boundary-line of *a new era, both of the outward and inward development of Christianity.*

BOOK II.

TRANSITION FROM THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIANITY AMONG THE JEWS, TO ITS DEVELOPMENT AMONG HEATHEN NATIONS.

CHAPTER I.

THE FIRST SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY FROM THE CHURCH AT JERUSALEM TO OTHER PARTS, AND ESPECIALLY AMONG THE HEATHEN.

SAMARIA, which had been the scene of Christ's personal ministry, was the first place out of Judea where the gospel was preached by his apostles.* Though the people of this country received no part of the Old Testament as sacred excepting the Pentateuch, yet from this portion of the Scriptures they had learned to exercise faith in a Messiah who was to come; on him they placed their hopes, as the personage who was to bring back all things to their right relations, and thus to be the universal Restorer.† Political considerations did not with them, as with the Jews, stand in the way of their right apprehension of the idea of the Messiah, an idea specially clung to by them in their mental and bodily misery; but they were deficient in that right understanding of it which could only be obtained from its progressive development in the Old Testament; nor could the deep feeling of the need of redemption and restoration be clearly developed among them. A lively, but indefinite, obscure longing of the religious nature always exposes men to manifold and most dangerous delusions, and in times of vague but earnest inquiry, various kinds of extravagance are likely to prevail. This was the case with the Samaritans. As at that time in other parts of the East, a similar indefinite longing after a new communication from Heaven—an ominous restlessness in the minds of men, such as generally precedes great changes in the history of mankind, was diffused abroad; so there were not wanting persons to misdirect and deceive this longing, while they falsely promised it satisfaction. Such were the Goëtæ, in whom was to be found a mixture of unconscious self-deception and intentional falsehood; with ideas, proceeding from an amalgamation of

* See Life of Christ, p. 180 ff.

† הַמָּשִׁיחַ or הַמָּלִיכָה. See Gesenius's Weihnachtsprogramm *De Samaritanorum Theologia*, (of the year 1822), and his *Carmina Samaritana*, p. 75.

Jewish, Oriental, and Grecian elements, and with mystical, sounding formulas exactly suited to a vague religious longing, they made great pretensions, boasting of a special connexion with the invisible world; and by taking advantage of the unknown powers of nature, and by various arts of conjuration, they excited the astonishment of credulous people, and obtained credit for their boastful pretensions. Such persons found at that time an easy access to the Samaritans in their state of mental excitement. To this class of men belonged a Jewish or Samaritan Goës, named Simon, who, by his pretended magical powers, so fascinated the people, that they said he must be more than man, that he was the great power which emanated from the invisible God, by which the universe had been brought forth, now appearing on earth in a bodily form.*

The idea of such an Intelligence emanating from God, as proceeding from the first act of the divine self-revelation, the first link in the chain of developed life, prevailed just at that time in various oriental-Alexandrian and Alexandrian-oriental forms. The idea also of the incarnation of higher intelligences generally, and of this highest intelligence in particular, was by no means foreign to the notions prevalent in those parts. We can hardly consider everything of this kind as a mere copy of the Christian idea of the incarnation, or recognise in it a sign of the transforming power of the new Christian spirit over the intellectual world; for we find earlier traces of such ideas.† But the prevalence of such ideas proves nothing against the originality of Christianity, or of any of its particular doctrines. On the one hand, we should not refuse to recognise what could grow from the germs already given in the Old Testament, which was the preparative covering of the New, or from its spirit and leading ideas, which were directed to Christ as the end of all the divine revelations. On the other hand, we must recollect, that as the new creation effected by Christianity was followed by a mighty agitation

* Possibly the words of which this Goës made use, are contained in the apocryphal writings of the Simonians; see Jerome's Commentary on Matt. xxiv. "Ego sum sermo Dei (ὁ λόγος), ego sum speciosus, ego paracletus," "I am the word of God (ὁ λόγος), I am the illustrious, I am the Advocate,"—(according to Philo, the Logos is Advocate, (παράκλητος, ἰκέτης,) since by the divine reason revealing itself in the phenomenal world (the νοητὸν παράδειγμα τοῦ κόσμου) the connexion between God and the phenomena is effected, what is defective in the latter is supplied; De Vita Mosis, l. iii. 673; De Migratione Abrahami, p. 406,)—"ego omnipotens, ego omnia Dei," "I am omnipotent, I, all things of God" (according to Philo, the Logos is the μετρόπολις πασῶν τῶν δυνάμεων τοῦ θεοῦ, chief of all the powers of God). Still this is uncertain, for the sect of the Simonians might easily borrow these expressions, as they had borrowed other things, from Christianity, and attribute them to Simon.

† In a Jewish apocryphal writing, the προσευχὴ Ἰωσήφ, the patriarch Jacob is represented as an incarnation of the highest spirit living in the presence of the divine Original Being, whose true divine name was "Israel, man beholding God," Ἰσραὴλ, ἀνὴρ ὁρῶν θεόν, "the first-born of every living thing existing by God," πρωτόγονος πάντος ζῶντος ζωομένου ὑπὸ θεοῦ, (similar expressions to those used by Philo respecting the Logos), "who was begotten before all angels, the first minister in the presence of God," ὁ ἐν πρῶτῳ θεοῦ λειτουργῶς πρῶτος. See Origen, t. ii. § 25.

both of kindred and hostile minds, so also it was preceded by the strong excitement of such minds as were unconsciously anticipating and yearning after some great approaching crisis, by a presentiment that there would be such a revelation of the spiritual world as had not yet been made to the human race. And from a teleological point of view, we recognise Christianity as the final aim of Divine Wisdom in the course of human development, when we at this period find the spiritual atmosphere surcharged with ideas, which served to prepare a more susceptible soil for Christianity and its leading doctrines, and to form a back-ground for the exhibition of the divine transactions which it announced.

Philip the Deacon, being compelled to leave Jerusalem by the persecution which ensued on Stephen's death, was induced to take refuge in Samaria. He came to a city of that country,* where Simon was universally esteemed, and looked upon with wonder and reverence as a supernatural being. When he saw the people so devoted to a destructive delusion, he felt impelled by his zeal for the cause of God and the salvation of men, to impart that to them which alone could give true satisfaction to their spiritual necessities. But men in this situation were not yet susceptible of the spiritual power of truth ; it was needful to pave a way to their hearts by preparatory impressions on the senses. As Philip, by divine aid, performed things which Simon with all his magical arts could not effect, especially healing the sick (which he accomplished by prayer and calling on the name of Christ), he attracted the attention of men to Him in whose name and power he had effected such things for them, and in their sight ; he then took occasion to discourse more fully of Him, his works, and the kingdom that he had established among men, and by degrees the divine power of truth laid hold of their hearts. When Simon saw his followers deserting him, and was himself astounded at the works performed by Philip, he thought it best to acknowledge a power so superior to his own. He therefore professed himself a disciple of Philip, and was, like the rest, baptized by him ; but as the sequel proves, we cannot infer from this that the publication of the gospel had made an impression on his heart ; it seems most probable that he interpreted what had occurred according to his own views. The miracles performed by Philip had led him to the conviction, that he was in league with some superhuman spirit ; he looked on baptism as an initiation into the compact, and hoped that, by forming such a compact, he might obtain an interest in such higher power, and use it for his own ends ; he wished, in short, to combine the new magic or theurgy with his own. As we have already remarked, it was a standing regulation in primitive

* It is not quite clear that the city of Samaria is intended ; for there is no reason, with some expositors of Acts viii. 5, to consider the genitive as the sign of apposition. As in the whole chapter Samaria is the designation of the country, it is most natural to understand it is so in this passage. In the 14th verse, by Samaria is certainly meant the country, and yet it does not follow that absolutely the whole land had received the gospel.

times, that all those who professed to believe the announcement of Jesus as the Messiah should be baptized. And since Simon now renounced his magical arts, which were quite out of repute, there was no reason why he should be rejected.

It must have occasioned great surprise to the church at Jerusalem to hear that Christianity had first gained an entrance among a people who were not considered as belonging to the theocratic nation. Not that any such scruples could be felt, as were afterward excited at the spread of the Gospel among the Gentiles, since the Samaritans, in common with the Jews, practised circumcision and observed the Law of Moses. Moreover, Christ himself had set the example by his personal ministry among the Samaritans, and had so far counteracted the prejudice against them. Yet the disunion between the Jews and the Samaritans was so great that the former could not view without some mistrust the formation of a church among the latter, and believed that they must ascertain the manner in which the Gospel operated among them before they could acknowledge the new believers as Christian brethren. There must have been a special reason for the mission of the Apostles Peter and John to Samaria. If we were to infer the object of their mission from the consequences that followed it,—as if these gifts of the Spirit could not be imparted by a deacon, but required the superior agency of the apostles,—we should proceed on an ungrounded supposition; and to infer the design from the consequences, is, as is clear, always very uncertain. With much greater right we may suppose, that a kind of mistrust was the cause of this mission. This mistrust must have related either to those among whom Philip labored, or to himself the laborer. It might certainly be the latter, as Baur supposes,—a consequence of the continually increasing opposition between the Christians of Palestinian and those of Hellenistic descent and education, a trace that the old church could not fully trust the freer mode of thinking among the Hellenistic preachers, which already began to be growing out of Christianity. But with greater certainty we are justified in regarding this mission as owing to the national distrust felt towards the Samaritans. Both grounds of mistrust might indeed be blended together, yet we find in the narrative no point of connexion for the first. At all events it is evident, that the manner in which the Gospel gained entrance among the Samaritans must have appeared to the two apostles as defective. Jesus had indeed been acknowledged as the Messiah, and baptism had been administered in his name, but the believers as yet knew nothing of the Holy Ghost; for what this might be could only be known from inward experience, and this was still something foreign to the Samaritans. They had received the baptism of water without receiving the baptism of the Spirit. The cause of this may be traced to the manner in which they became believers; for according to the universal law of the development of the Christian life, the effects of faith are conditioned by its quality, and this again, by the mode of its origination. Among the Samaritans, living faith in the Re-

deemer appears to have been still wanting, since it was not a feeling of the need of redemption founded in the consciousness of sin that had led them to believe ; their faith does not yet appear to have proceeded from the right religious and moral principle. It was at first in their minds only an undefined and obscure longing after fresh and higher revelations, and this longing was still more perverted from its true aim by the deceptive arts of the Goës, Simon, which, from the partial satisfaction they gave, led them still further astray. The superiority of Philip, which was evinced in his works, had moved them afterwards to believe him rather than Simon, to place confidence in his words rather than in Simon's. Still this was a faith which proceeded from impressions on the senses, and depended on the person of him whom they had beheld performing such wonderful works. What Philip announced to them, and they had been moved by outward appearances to acknowledge as true, still remained to them something external. The Christ whom he preached was to them only an outward object of faith, and had not yet passed into their inner life. The operation of the Holy Ghost was still something foreign which astonished them in its effects produced through another person. They still lacked an individual, independent divine life. Hence they could not yet understand what the Holy Ghost might be. Certainly the two apostles would perceive that what Philip had effected was only the beginning, and that still more must take place, in order to found a true Christian church.

We have not a full account in the Acts of what was done by Peter and John, but simply the general results. No doubt these apostles carried on the work of Philip by preaching and prayer. After such a preparation, the believers were assembled, and the apostles prayed that Christ might glorify himself in them, as in all believers, by marks of the communication of divine life, employing the usual sign of Christian consecration, the laying on of hands. Manifestations now followed similar to those on the day of Pentecost, and the believers were thus recognised and attested to be a Christian church, standing in an equal rank with the first church at Jerusalem. But Simon was naturally incapable of understanding the spiritual connexion of these manifestations ; he saw in all of them merely the workings of magical forms and charms, a magic differing not in nature but only in degree from what he practised himself. Hence he imagined that the apostles might communicate these magical powers to him also, by virtue of which all those on whom he laid hands would become filled with divine power, and with this view he offered them money. Peter spurned this proposal with abhorrence, and now first saw in its true light the real character of Simon, who, in joining himself to believers, had pretended to be what he was not. Peter's terrible rebuke presents him to us as a faithful preacher of the gospel, insisting most impressively on the supreme importance of *disposition* in everything which is imparted by Christianity, in direct opposition to the art of magic, which disregards the necessary connexion

of the divine and supernatural with the disposition of the heart, drage them down into the circle of the natural, and attempts to appropriate to itself divine power by means of something else than that which is allied to it in human nature, and is the only possible point of connexion for it.* These were Peter's words: "Thy gold, with which thou attemptest to traffic in impiety, perish with thee. Do not deceive thyself, as if with this disposition thou couldst have any part in what is promised to believers. Thou hast no share in this matter,† for God, who sees what is within, is not deceived by thy hypocritical professions. Before his eyes thy intentions are manifest. With sincere repentance for such wickedness, pray to God that he would be pleased to forgive thee this wicked design." This rebuke made a great impression at the time on Simon's conscience, inclined more to superstition than to faith, and awakened a feeling not of repentance for the sinfulness of his disposition, but of apprehension of the divine vengeance. He entreated the apostles that they would pray to the Lord for him, that what they had threatened him with might not come to pass.

As is usual with such sudden impressions on the senses, the effect on Simon was only transient, for all the further notices we have of him show that he soon returned to his former courses. About ten or twenty years later, we meet with a Simon in the company of Felix, the Roman Procurator of Palestine, so strikingly resembling this man, that we are tempted to consider them as identical.‡ The latter Simon appears as an

* The poetical fancies of Christian antiquity, which make Peter the representative of the principle of simple faith in revelation, and Simon the representative of the magical and theosophic tendency in the human mind, have a great truth at their basis. But the narrative in the Acts is clearly distinguished by the genuine historical impress from all those fancies, so that no one, unless his mind be so far perverted as to have lost all perception of the difference between fiction and historical reality, can fail to recognise it.

† I cannot agree with those who understand *λόγος* (Acts viii. 21) in the sense of the Hebrew *דבר* = *ῥῆμα*, (thing spoken of, matter,) and suppose that Peter only told Simon that he could have no share in that thing, in that higher power which he hankered after. In this general sense, *ῥῆμα* is indeed used in the New Testament, but not the more definite term *λόγος*. And according to this interpretation, Peter would say less than the context requires; for looking at the connexion of v. 21 with 20 and 22, it is plain, he did not merely say, that Simon with such a disposition was excluded from participating in this higher power, but also, from the kingdom of God, and that he was thereby bringing condemnation on himself. Hence we understand the word *λόγος* in the common New Testament meaning of divine doctrine—"the doctrine or truth announced by us"—at the same time including by synecdoche, all that a person would be authorized to receive by the appropriation of this doctrine. I am not convinced by what Meyer in his commentary, p. 123, urges against this interpretation, that it is at variance with the connexion, in which there is no mention made of the doctrine. For in the mind of the speaker, the power of working miracles could not be separated from the publication of the gospel and faith in it; and as Simon in the disposition of his mind was far from the gospel, and could stand in no sort of fellowship with it, it followed as a matter of course, that he could have no share in the ability to work such miracles.

‡ On the other hand, there is the difference of country, for the Simon to whom we refer, and whom Josephus mentions (*Antiq. Book xx. ch. vii. § 2*), was a Jew from Cyprus;

unprincipled magician,* to whom all persons, whatever their character, were welcome, provided they gave credit to his enchantments. With equal arrogance, he disclaimed all respect for the ancient forms of religion, and for the laws of morality. He was a confidant of the Roman procurator Felix, and therefore could never have opposed his vicious inclinations, but on the contrary he made his magic subservient to their gratification; he thus bound Felix more closely to himself, as a single example will show. The immoral Felix had indulged a passion for Drusilla, sister of King Herod Agrippa, and wife of King Azizus of Emesa, a Jewish proselyte. Simon allowed himself to be the tool of Felix, for gratifying his unlawful desires. He persuaded Drusilla that by his superhuman power he could ensure great happiness for her, provided she married Felix, and managed to overcome her scruples of conscience against marrying a heathen. The character of this Simon is stamped on the later theosophic goëtic sect of the Simonians, whose tenets were a mixture of Oriental, Jewish, Samaritan, and Grecian religious elements. The germ of their principles may be plainly traced back to this Simon, though we cannot attribute to him the complete system of this sect as it existed in the second century.

The two apostles returned again to Jerusalem, and as what they had witnessed convinced them of the susceptibility of the Samaritans for receiving the gospel, they availed themselves of the opportunity of publishing it in all the parts of the country through which they passed. But Philip extended his missionary journey further, and became the instrument of bringing the first seeds of the gospel into Ethiopia, (the kingdom of Candace at Meroe,) though, as far as our knowledge of history goes,† without any important consequences. But, what is more deserving of notice, he published the gospel in the cities of Palestine, on the southern and northern coasts of the Mediterranean, till at last, probably after a considerable time, he settled at Cæsarea Stratonis, where

but Simon Magus, according to Justin Martyr, himself a native of Samaria, was born at a place called Gittim, in Samaria. Yet this evidence is not decisive, for a tradition so long after the time, though prevalent in the country where Simon made his appearance, might be erroneous. What has been said since I wrote the above, against the identity of the two Simons, is not demonstrative, though I willingly allow, that since the name of Simon was a very common one among the Jews, and such itinerant Gōetæ were not seldom to be met with, the time also not perfectly agreeing, the identity must be left rather doubtful.

* *μύγον εἶναι σκηπτόμενον*, says Josephus.

† It is still a question whether the introduction of Christianity was not partially made before the mission of Frumentius, from another direction, and in a different part of Ethiopia; whether many things in the doctrine and usages of the present Abyssinian church, with which we have been better acquainted by means of Gobat's Journal, do not indicate a Jewish-Christian origin. If I am not mistaken, the late Rettig has brought forward these questions in the "*Studien und Kritiken*." Perhaps intercourse with that ancient church will open to us some sources of information for answering them.

on his arrival he found a Christian society already formed, which he enlarged and built up in the faith.

Though the Christians of Jewish descent, who were driven by persecution from Jerusalem were, doubtless, by that event led to spread the gospel even in Syria and the neighboring districts, yet their labors were confined to Jews. On the other hand, the Hellenists, such as Philip and others, who originally came from Cyprus and Cyrene, made their way among the Gentiles* also, to whom they were allied by language and education, which was not the case with the other Jews. They presented them with the gospel independent of the Mosaic law, without attempting to make them Jews before they became Christians. Thus the principles held by the enlightened Stephen, the truths for which, in part, he had suffered martyrdom, were by them first brought into practice and realized. But if now in this way, independently of the exertions of the apostles in Judea, and the development of Christianity in a Jewish form, churches had been raised of purely Hellenistic materials among the heathen, free altogether from Judaism, and if Paul had then appeared to extend and confirm this tendency still farther, the consequence might have been, that the older apostles would have maintained with greater stiffness their former convictions, in opposition to this freer direction of Christianity, and thus, by the overweight of human peculiarities in the first publishers of the gospel, a violent and irreconcilable opposition might have divided the church into two hostile contending parties. It could not have happened otherwise if the germinating differences, left altogether to themselves, as in later times, had been so developed that at last each must exclude the other; and the idea of a universal church, prevailing by its higher unity over all human differences, could never have been realized. But this disturbing influence, with which the self-seeking and one-sided bias of human nature threatened from the beginning to destroy the unity of the divine work, was counteracted by the still mightier influence of the Holy Spirit, who never allows human differences to develop themselves to such an extreme, but is able to maintain unity in manifoldness. We may distinctly recognise the Providence of Divine Wisdom—which gives scope to the free agency of man, but knows exactly when it is needful, for the success of the divine work, to impart its immediate illumination—if we observe that when the apostles needed a wider development of their Christian views for the exercise of their calling, and the want of such development might have been highly injurious, just at that precise moment the needed insight was imparted to them, by a memorable coincidence of an internal revelation with a train of outward circumstances. The Apostle Peter was the chosen instrument on this occasion.

* In Acts xi. 20, the common reading *ἑλληνιστάς* is evidently to be rejected, as formed from a false gloss, and the reading which refers to the Gentiles (*ἑλλήνας*) must be substituted as undoubtedly correct.

But before we proceed any further, we must take notice of what has been urged from two different directions against the credibility of the account in the Acts which we here follow, and against the internal probability of the whole narrative.* The position which Peter afterwards occupied in relation to Paul and to the preaching of Paul among the heathen, must testify, it is said, against his having attained to views similar to those of Paul, in a peculiar, independent manner. It is thought that Peter's vacillation as exhibited in his conference with Paul at Antioch, would be inexplicable on such a supposition, but that every difficulty will be removed, if we suppose that Peter was forced from without, in opposition to his own convictions and mode of thinking, by the personal superiority of Paul, and the undeniable facts of his ministry, to admit an independent development of Christianity among the Gentiles.

But is it, then, really probable, that men who were wedded to the mode of thinking which made participation in the salvation of the Messiah dependent on the observance of the Mosaic Law, should allow themselves so easily to be moved, solely and entirely by the mental superiority of an individual who, from the difference between his own standpoint and theirs, must have been the less fitted to operate upon them, or by an adduction of facts which testified of the similar effects of faith in Gentiles and Jews, to the admission of a principle which ran counter to the whole system of their deeply-rooted convictions? We know full well, how hard it is to conquer inveterate prejudices by an appeal to external facts—how strongly men are disposed to explain away, or to interpret in their own favor, all facts which may testify against their prejudices. And would a man of Peter's strongly marked individuality, be the kind of person to be induced to give up his principles, by an influence wholly external, without any immediate point of connexion in his own course of development? It will be a far more natural explanation, if we can show a preparation for such an acknowledgment on the part of Peter through the medium of his own inward experience. The first point of connexion lay in the nature of the truth announced by Christ, and in his words, which led to an apprehension of it. If this be admitted, it will be self-evident how a development proceeding from Peter's own Christian consciousness might gradually prepare him for such an acknowledgment. But this development from within might also be supported by outward facts, which might easily be forthcoming, if, before the entrance of Paul on his apostleship, the publication of the Gospel had anyhow come into contact with the Gentiles; when it would be perceived that among *them* also the hearts of men invited and admitted it.

* By Gfrörer, in his work, "Die heilige Sage," 1 Abth. s. 444, and by Baur, in his often-quoted work on Paul. Gfrörer proceeds on the supposition that the Acts consist of two distinct parts, and that the first part was composed by a follower of Peter; and Baur, on the supposition that the whole was pervaded by a henotic or conciliatory design; but they both arrive at similar results.

But, of course, Christian truth cannot gain full possession of the inner man without a struggle. Everywhere we shall have been prepared to expect in the development of Christianity a co-operation of the supernatural and the natural. And now when we find an account handed down which corresponds to all these points, we cannot hesitate to acknowledge the impress of nature and of truth. Idea and history are brought into unison with each other. Moreover, Peter evidently occupies a middle position between James and Paul, and to this intermediate position must therefore correspond also his own course of development.

If we examine it closely, what Paul says in the second chapter of his Epistle to the Galatians respecting his relation to Peter, and that apostle's relation to Judaism, so far from contradicting the view we are advocating, perfectly agrees with it. If we carefully weigh what Paul there says, we shall naturally be led to assume such a course in Peter's development as has been indicated.

When Peter, under the influence of the Jewish Christians at Antioch, was led to abstain from free intercourse with the Gentile Christians, Paul did not consider it necessary first of all to convince him of the truths that were opposed to his line of conduct, but taking for granted his theoretic agreement with him, only accused him of the contradiction between his principles and his conduct at that time. He could not have expressed more strongly the freedom with which Peter had hitherto acted in reference to the Mosaic Law; Gal. ii. 14, "If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as the Jews?" It is evident from these very words of Paul, that Peter had expressed by his actions the conviction that salvation did not depend on the observance of the law; that he had felt no scruple to live with the Gentiles as a Gentile, as Paul, in v. 16, avers, speaking from his own stand-point and that of Peter as identical; "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ." In v. 18, he charges him with seeking to restore what he had already destroyed; which can only refer to that renunciation of the Mosaic Law which was involved in Peter's former line of conduct. Here, therefore, such a revolution is presupposed in Peter's views as cannot be sufficiently explained by the influence of another person on his mind. If it had proceeded from the influence of Paul alone, should we not find a hint referring to it in some part of the Pauline Epistles? Had not Paul, when he declared that he needed not first to learn the truths of the Gospel from the apostles in Palestine—that from the beginning he had acted independently in the publication of the Gospel—the most natural opportunity for making this claim, that Peter first through him had learnt the true nature of the Gospel in relation to the Mosaic Law, and to do homage to the principles first of all laid down by himself as the only correct ones?

The narrative in the Acts furnishes us here with the only right clue to the course of Peter's religious development, the clue which we are com-

pelled also to seek by the nature of the case. The narrative is in fact drawn from life, and contains in it all the elements from which a natural vivid representation can be formed, although the author himself has been at no pains to make it such.* It cannot be called an arbitrary manufacture of history, if we employ the same means which every historian must use where he has to form a vivid historical representation from an account which does not develop all the points requisite for a perfect understanding of the facts. Necessarily he must amplify many things which are not literally contained in the account lying before him, but of which the outlines are given, if he would unite everything in one picture according to the laws of analogy. In the account given in the Acts, the chief concern is to give prominence to the supernatural and the divine; that is here the one side belonging to historical truth; the natural circumstances and natural connexion of causes and effects, to which the narrator did not direct his attention, we must endeavor to fill out according to the indications contained in the account itself.

The impulse once given to the further spread of the Gospel beyond the bounds of Judea could not stop. Thus we find churches founded in the west on the coast of the Mediterranean Sea, though of their origin we have no distinct account. Possibly the happy effects of their visit to the Samaritans induced both the apostles, or at least the energetic Peter, to extend their missionary labors. Or it might be, that the scattering abroad of the believers, occasioned by the persecution against Stephen, led to the founding of these churches. At all events it was natural—since the apostles were at first the Patriarchs (so to speak) of the whole church, and in the original community of believers everything was under their guidance—that the newly-founded foreign churches should also stand under their superintendence. And in virtue of the gift of church-guidance peculiar to Peter, recognised and actually claimed for him by Christ himself, the business of taking the oversight of the younger churches must have been specially committed to him. A visitation

* Even Baur has acknowledged that the notion of a mythical composition is not admissible here. He thinks that he has detected a designed fabrication for an apologetic, conciliatory object that lies at the basis of the whole book of the Acts. But as we cannot in general find in the simple character of this book any ground or point of connexion to support the charge of such a *fraus pia* pervading the whole of it, so we think that as to this particular part, whoever views the narrative with an unprejudiced eye, must decide against Baur's unnatural, artificial construction of it. The vision that happened to Peter which related to the rights of the Gentiles to a participation in the kingdom of the Messiah, was copied (according to Baur) from the appearance of Christ to Paul, for the purpose of accrediting his call as an apostle to the Gentiles, (p. 78,) and contained the legitimation of those rights. Such things may, indeed, be imagined if persons are disposed to fashion the materials lying before them according to their arbitrary preconceptions, or if they look at everything only through spectacles of their own making, and see in all things the reflection of their own odd fancies. But whoever is not suffering from such optical infirmity, will find nothing whatever in this whole narrative which can justify such a comparison.

journey of this kind led him to the churches founded in the west on the coast of the Mediterranean Sea.* He was still accustomed to labor only among the Jews; yet he had already, as we have seen, visited a people not belonging to the theocratic nation, the Samaritans, who had experienced the operations of the Holy Spirit through faith in Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah. Already he would have heard of the preaching of the Gospel among the Gentiles by the scattered Hellenists, and of the susceptibility which was found to exist in the hearts of the Gentiles; perhaps, also, he had had an opportunity, in the course of his ministry among the Jews who lived in the midst of the heathen world, of noticing traces of that deep concern with which many Gentiles listened to his preaching. And what he actually witnessed might bring to his remembrance many things which Christ intimated in his discourses. Thus there might be a preparation for the entrance of new light into his soul, though it could not penetrate all at once. There was necessarily a conflict in his soul between the rays of the new light, and the darkness arising from his earlier habits of thinking. But now a divine call reached him from without, and co-operated with what was taking place within his breast.

As among the Gentiles, at that time, there were many noble-minded men, dissatisfied with the ancient superstition, who longed with conscious or unconscious anxiety after a divine revelation which might impart the confidence of religious conviction† raised above the strife of human opinions, so we recognise in the centurion Cornelius a representative of this better class of Gentiles, an historical image from the life, and no mythical personage. He belonged to the Roman cohort which formed the garrison of Cæsarea Stratonis, a town on the sea-coast, thirty-five miles from Joppa. This man appears first, like many of those among the Gentiles who were filled with a sense of their religious wants, and were seeking after the truth, to have turned from the popular polytheism

* Acts ix. 31. Baur's assertion (p. 40), that this was undertaken in order to counteract the more liberal principles spread abroad by the Hellenists, we cannot regard as properly supported, since no trace of it can be found in the narrative itself. Nor does it by any means follow, because there is nothing said here of laying on of hands and the communication of the Holy Spirit, that these things, therefore, in the ministry of the apostles among the Samaritans are unhistorical. Although both journeys come under the common category of visitations, yet the difference—a difference of object and in the mode of operation arising from the different class of persons, in one case the Samaritans, in the other the dispersed Jews, among whom the foundation of the Church had been already laid—is not on that account destroyed.

† A prophetic longing, such as is contained in those words in Plato's Phædon, although it might not be so strictly intended by the philosopher, where it is said, that "taking the best and hardest to be refuted of human opinions, a man must venture on the voyage of life, carried over on this, as on a raft, unless he can be carried over more securely and with less danger in a more trustworthy conveyance, or some divine word:" τὸν γοῦν βέλτιστον τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων λόγων λαβόντα καὶ δυσεξελεγκτότατον, ἐπὶ τούτου ὀχοῦμεν, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ σχεδίας κινδυνεύοντα διαπλεῦσαι τὸν βίον· εἰ μὴ τις δύναιτο ἀσφαλέστερον καὶ ἀκινδυνότερον ἐπὶ βεβαιότερου ὀχήματος ἢ λόγου θείου τινὸς διαπορευθῆναι.—Ed. Bip. vol. I. p. 194.

to the worship of Jehovah in Judaism, and thus to have reached a theistic stand-point which formed a bridge for him to Christianity.

Having with his whole family professed the worship of Jehovah, he manifested by his benefactions the sympathy he felt with his fellow-worshippers of the Jewish nation, and observed the hours of prayer customary to the Jews; so that there is scarcely any room to doubt that he belonged to the class of Proselytes of the Gate. Nor can we infer the contrary from the circumstance that Peter and the stricter Jewish Christians looked on Cornelius as an unclean person, and in many respects the same as a heathen. The Proselytes of the Gate were certainly permitted to attend the synagogue worship, which was a means of gradually bringing them to a full reception of Judaism. Yet the Jews who adopted the stricter maxims of the Pharisees, placed all the uncircumcised in the class of the unclean, and avoided living and eating with such persons as defiling. Unless we suppose this to have been the case, what afterwards occurred in reference to the stricter pharisaical-minded Jewish Christians, and the Gentile Christians who had been partly Proselytes of the Gate, would appear altogether enigmatical.

The Proselytes of the Gate, who borrowed from Judaism the general principles of Theism, but separated them from all that gave it vitality, found in it consequently not enough for their religious necessities. But they were roused by this felt deficiency to search and examine. With this, the expectation of the Messiah, which easily passed over to them from the Jews, was fitted to harmonize, and must assume a form corresponding to the stand-point and spirit of their seeking; it was not difficult for them to strip off the sensuous political covering. Now a person of such a religious tendency of mind and disposition as Cornelius, must have had his attention roused when he heard that the Messiah, from whom he expected fresh divine light, had appeared, and when he heard of the spread of the new announcements, and of Peter's extraordinary works; for we shall be quite justified in assuming that such a report had reached him of what had taken place in the surrounding country. And here we must apply what we have before remarked respecting the use of the accounts in the Acts as historical records; and especially as respects the mode in which Cornelius was induced to send for Peter, his own deposition must have been the original source from which alone every other account could have been derived, and to which every other must be traced back. But we are not justified in assuming that Cornelius, who certainly could best testify of the facts relating to his own state of mind, of what he had himself experienced, was equally capable of distinguishing from his experience the objective, which lay at the ground of it. We cannot suppose that the state of his mind and the direction of his thoughts were such as to enable him to distinguish between the objective and subjective. As he felt himself pressed, he testified of the divine with which his soul was filled, without being able to direct his attention to the natural circumstances which were

preparatory to the divine operation,—to connect the natural with the supernatural, and thus to unite everything that occurred into one complete representation. The deposition of Cornelius as to what happened to himself, must be regarded from this point of view, that by a comparison with existing historical circumstances and conditions we may arrive at a right understanding of the whole proceeding. We are, therefore, justified in supplying many circumstances, which, though not expressly mentioned, are yet to be assumed; not in order to obscure what was divine in the event, but to glorify the manifold wisdom of God as shown in the way men are led to a participation of redemption, in the connexion of the divine and the natural, and in the harmony that subsists between nature and grace; Eph. iii. 10. In the picture which we are enabled to form by this combination of views, all the particular traits may not possess equal certainty. But we may be assured that an exhibition as a whole will remain, of which no sophistical, destructive, arbitrary criticism can deprive us.

Cornelius had devoted himself for some days to fasting and prayer, which were frequently used conjointly by the Jews and first Christians—the former either as the means of making the soul more capable (by detaching it from sense) for undisturbed converse with divine things, or from a temporary cessation of bodily want, the natural consequence of deep mental abstraction. This they were wont to do when, in an emergency from inward or outward distress, they sought relief and illumination from God. We may, therefore, presume that something similar was the case with Cornelius, and naturally ask, what it was that so troubled him? From the whole narrative we see that his ardent longing was for religious truth that would bring peace and repose to his heart. Hence it is most probable, that on that account he sought illumination from God by fervent prayer. And what occasioned his seeking it precisely at this time? From the words of the angel to Cornelius, it is by no means certain that the apostle Peter was wholly unknown to him. Peter himself, in his discourse before the family of Cornelius, Acts x. 37, appears to have presumed that they had already heard of the doctrine of Christ. We may suppose from earlier indications that his attention had been drawn to Christianity and also to Peter, the proclaimer of it. He had probably heard very dissimilar opinions respecting Christianity; from many zealous Jews, judgments altogether condemnatory; from others, opinions which led him to expect that in the new doctrine he would at last find what he had been so long seeking: thus a conflict would naturally arise in his mind which would impel him to seek illumination from God on a question that so anxiously occupied his thoughts.

It was the fourth day* since Cornelius had been in this state of mind,

* The right interpretation of Acts x. 30, is of interest here. Many have interpreted the words as equivalent to—"Four days ago I fasted to this time," namely, the ninth hour when he was speaking; and thus only one fast day was kept by Cornelius, in the ninth hour of which this happened. This agrees perfectly with the reckoning of the time

when, about three in the afternoon, one of the customary Jewish hours of prayer, while he was calling on God with earnest supplication, he received by a voice from heaven an answer to his prayers. The appearance of the angel may be considered as an objective event. The soul belongs in its essence to a higher than the sensible and temporal order of things, and none but a contracted and arrogant reason can deny the possibility of a communication between the higher world and the soul which is allied to it by its very nature. The Holy Scriptures teach us that such occasional communications from a higher spiritual world to individuals used to occur in the history of mankind, until the central point of all communications from heaven to earth, the Divine Fountain of life itself, appeared among us, and thereby established forever the communion between heaven and earth; John i. 52. We need not, however, suppose any sensible appearance, for we do not know but that a higher spirit may communicate itself to men living in a world of sense, by an operation on the inward sense, so that this communication may appear under the form of a sensuous perception. Meanwhile, Cornelius himself is the only witness for the objective reality of the angelic appearance, and he can only be taken as a credible witness of what he *believed* that he had perceived. By the influence of the Divine Spirit, an elevation of mind might have been naturally connected with his devotion, in which the internal communication from heaven might have been represented to the higher self-consciousness under the form of a vision.* Although, in the words of the angel, "Thy prayers and alms are come up for a memorial in the sight of God," the expression is anthropopathic, and adapted to the then Jewish mode of speech; yet this relates only to the form of the expression; it is the divine in human form. There is designated by it only the divine thought, that the striving of the devout anxiety of Cornelius, which was shown to the extent of his ability by prayer and works of love towards the worshippers of Jehovah, had not been unheeded by the Fatherly love of God which cherishes every germ of goodness; that God had heard the prayer of his longing after heavenly truth, and had sent him, in the person of Peter, a teacher of this truth. From the whole

But the meaning of ἀπὸ favors our rendering the passage, "I fasted to the ninth hour of the fourth day," in which this happened. Kuinoel's objection to this interpretation is not pertinent; for, from the manner in which Cornelius expressed himself, it must be evident that the vision happened on the ninth hour of the fourth fast-day. Now, the passage can be understood to mean, either that Cornelius was wont to fast four days in the week to three o'clock of each day, or that for four days he fasted the entire time up to the ninth hour of the fourth day, when this happened. But fasts, according to the Jewish Christian mode of speaking, did not imply an entire abstinence from all nourishment. I cannot agree with Meyer's interpretation, as I understand it, that Peter meant that he had fasted four days, and on the fourth day reckoning backwards, that is, the day on which the fast began, about three o'clock, this event happened. Had this been said, then εἰμὶ must have been used in verse 30, and what follows also must have been different.

* The word *ὄραμα*, vision, (Acts x. 3) cannot here be decisive, since it may be used in speaking of an ecstatic vision or of a real appearance as an objective fact.

form of this narrative, it must be inferred that Cornelius considered the pointing out of Peter's place of residence, not as something that came to his knowledge in a natural way, but by a supernatural communication. It is indeed possible that he had heard it mentioned by others casually in conversation; but, as he had not thought further about it, it had completely escaped his recollection, and now in this elevated state of mind what had been forgotten was brought back again to his consciousness, without his remembering the natural connection. After all, this is only possible, and we are by no means justified in considering it necessary. The possibility therefore equally remains, that this information was communicated in a supernatural way.

No sooner had Cornelius obtained this important and joyful certainty, than he sent two of his slaves, and a soldier that waited on him, who also was a Proselyte of the Gate, to fetch the longed-for teacher of divine truth. But this divine leading would not have attained its end, Peter would not have complied with the request of Cornelius, if he had not been prepared exactly at the same time, by the inward enlightening of the Divine Spirit, to acknowledge and rightly interpret this outward call of God. In the conjunction of remarkable circumstances which it was necessary should meet so critically, in order to bring about this important result for the historical development of Christianity, the guiding wisdom of eternal love undoubtedly manifests itself.

It was about noon, on the next day, when Peter withdrew to the roof of the house (built flat, in the oriental style) where he lodged at Joppa, in order to offer up his mid-day devotions. We can easily suppose that the prayer of the man who had been so zealously occupied in publishing the gospel in that region, would especially relate to this great object, the extension of the kingdom of Christ. And now while new views respecting the spread of the gospel were opening to his mind, there might have taken place in his soul that conflict of opposite principles to which we have already alluded. A divine light must decide the point.

While thus occupied in prayer, the demands of animal nature pressed upon him. He arose for the noon-tide meal, which had yet to be prepared. In the meantime, the meditations which had occupied him in prayer again abstracted him from sensible objects. Two tendencies of his nature met together. The higher, the power of the divine, had the mastery over his spirit, and the power of sensuous want over his lower nature. Thus, it came to pass, that the divine and the natural were mingled together,* not so as to obscure the divine; but the divine

* What Plutarch says of such an appearance of the higher life is remarkable: *ὡς οἱ δῖνοι τῶν ἁμα κύκλῳ καταφερομένων σωμάτων οὐκ ἐπικρατοῦσι βεβαίως, ἀλλὰ κύκλῳ μὲν ὑπ' ἀνάγκης φερομένων, κάτω δὲ φύσει βεπόντων, γίνεται τις ἐξ ἀμφοῖν παραχώδης καὶ παρίφορος ἐλιγμὸς, οὕτως ὁ καλούμενος ἐνθουσιασμὸς ἔοικε μίξις εἶναι κινήσεων δυοῖν, τὴν μὲν ὡς πέπονθε τῆς ψυχῆς ἁμα, τὴν δὲ ὡς πέφυκε κινουμένης; (just as the revolutions of bodies borne downward, are not firmly controlled, but being necessarily carried in a circle, while naturally carried downward, there ensues a certain confused and unsteady motion.*

availed itself of the reflection of the natural as an image, a symbolic vehicle for the truth about to be revealed to Peter. The divine light that was breaking through the atmosphere of traditionary representations, and making its way to his spirit, revealed itself in the mirror of sensible images which proceeded from the existing state of his bodily frame. Absorbed in divine meditations, and forgetting himself in the Divine, Peter saw heaven open, and from thence a vessel, as it had been a great sheet knit at four corners,* corresponding to the four quarters of the heavens, was let down to the earth. In this vessel he saw birds, four-footed beasts, and edible creeping things of various kinds, and a voice from heaven called upon him to slay one or other of these creatures and to prepare it for food. But against this requirement his Jewish notions revolted, accustomed as he was to distinguish between clean and unclean meats. He now heard a voice from heaven which refuted his scruples with these very significant words, "What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common." It is clear that in the explanation of these pregnant words regard must be had to their several references. First, in their application to the sensible objects here represented. "Thou must not by human wilfulness make a distinction of clean and unclean between creatures, all of which God has declared to be clean, by letting them down to thee from heaven." This letting down from heaven was partly a symbol, that all are alike clean as being the creatures of God, partly, that the new revelation, the new creation from heaven, presents all as pure. Then the higher application of the words intended by the Spirit of God, in reference to the relation of man to God: that every distinction of clean and unclean would be taken away from among men; that all men as the creatures of God would be considered as alike clean, and would again become pure as at their original creation, by the redemption that related to all.

After Peter had again expressed his scruples, this voice was repeated a third time, and he saw the vessel taken up again to heaven. He now returned from the state of ecstatic vision, to that of ordinary consciousness. While he was endeavoring to trace the connection between the vision and the subject of his late meditations, the event that now occurred taught him what the Spirit of God intended by the vision. Voices of

so what is called enthusiasm seems to be a mixture of two movements—one, that of the soul moving as it is acted upon; the other, that of the soul moving according to its natural constitution.)—De Pyth. Orac. c. 21.

* If the words *δεδεμένον καὶ* (Acts x. 11) are genuine, then on comparing them with xi. 5, we must, with Meyer, interpret them, not, "bound together at the four corners," but, "bound to four corners." But it is a question, whether these words, which are wanting in the Cod. Alex. *ρ. ε.* and in the Vulgate, are not to be considered as a gloss, and left out, as in Lachmann's edition, and then the clause will be equivalent to "letting itself down at four corners from Heaven," as the Vulgate translates it, "quatuor initiis submitti de cœlo." At all events, these four corners are not without significance. As they corresponded to the four quarters of the heavens, they conveyed an intimation that men from the north and the south, the east and the west, would appear as clean before God, and be called to a participation of the kingdom of God.

strangers in the court of the house, by whom his own name was repeated, excited his attention. They were the three messengers of Cornelius who were inquiring for him. They had left Cæsarea the day before at three o'clock, and arrived at Joppa that very day about noon. While Peter was observing the men, who by their appearance were evidently not Jews, the Spirit of God imparted to him a knowledge of the connection between the symbolic vision and the errand of these persons. A voice within said, God has sent these men to seek thee out, that thou mayest preach the gospel to the heathen. Go confidently with them, without dreading intercourse with the Gentiles as unclean, for thou hast been taught by a voice from heaven that thou must not dare to consider those unclean whom God himself has pronounced clean, and whom he now sends to thee. On the next day he departed with the messengers from Joppa, accompanied by six other Christians of Jewish descent, to whom he had told what had happened, and who awaited the result with eager expectation. As the distance for one day's journey was too great, they made two short days' journey of it. On the day after their departure, (the fourth after the messengers had been despatched by Cornelius,) about three in the afternoon, they arrived at Cæsarea. They found Cornelius assembled with his family and friends, whom he had informed of the expected arrival of the teacher sent to him from heaven; for he doubted not that he whom the voice of the angel had notified as the appointed divine teacher, would obey the divine call. After what had passed, Peter appeared to Cornelius as a superhuman being. He fell reverently before him as he entered the chamber; but Peter bade him stand up, saying, "Stand up, I myself also am a man." He narrated to the persons assembled by what means he had been induced not to regard the common scruples of the Jews respecting intercourse with heathens, and expressed his desire to hear from Cornelius what had determined *them* to call him thither. Cornelius explained this, and ended with saying, "Now therefore are we all here present before God, to hear all things that are commanded thee of God." Peter was astonished at the pure disposition so susceptible to divine truth, which appeared in the words of Cornelius, and formed so striking a contrast to the obstinate unsusceptibility of many Jews; and he perceived the hand of God in the way Cornelius had been led, since he had sought the truths of salvation with upright desire. Peter therefore said, "Now I perceive of a truth that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness is accepted of him." As to these memorable words, the sense cannot be, that in every nation, every one who only rightly employs his own moral power, will obtain salvation; for had Peter meant this, he would, in what he added, announcing Jesus as him by whom alone men could obtain forgiveness of sin and salvation, have contradicted himself. On that supposition, he ought rather to have told Cornelius, that he had only to remain in his present disposition, this was enough, and he needed no new doctrine of salvation. But, on the other

hand, it is impossible, according to the connection, to understand by "every one that feareth God and worketh righteousness," those who had attained true piety *through Christianity*, and to make the words mean no more than this—that *Christians* in all nations are acceptable to God; for the words plainly import that Cornelius, on account of his upright, pious striving, was deemed worthy of having his prayers heard, and being led to faith in the Redeemer. Nor can these words relate only to such as already believed in the revelation of God in the Old Testament, and according to its guidance worshipped God, and expected the Messiah. But evidently Peter spoke in opposition to the Jewish nationalism—God judgeth men not according to their descent or non-descent from the theocratic nation, but according to their disposition. All who, like Cornelius, worship God uprightly according to the measure of the means given to them, are acceptable to him, and he prepares by his grace a way for them, by which they are led to faith in Him who alone can bestow salvation. This is what Peter meant to announce to them.*

As all the conditions under which a living faith in the Redeemer is formed, existed in the souls of these men who were seeking after salvation, so by the powerful testimony of Peter such a faith was soon awakened, and, after such preparation, followed more quickly than would otherwise have happened. And as this faith in the process of its formation and in its quality differed essentially from the faith of the Samaritans, which arose more from outward events, and adhered to what was external, so also the effects were in an inverted relation. While among the Samaritans, no trace was to be seen of the effects of the baptism of the Spirit, even after they had received water-baptism; here, on the contrary, in these men, who were so prepared, the usual marks of the outpouring of the Spirit were perceptible, even before they had received baptism. The word, which found a receptive soil in their hearts, effected everything by its indwelling power, and these effects of the word testified their well founded claim to baptism. While Peter was speaking to them, they were impelled to express their feelings in inspired praises of that God who, in so wonderful a manner, had led them to salvation. One inspiration seized all, and with amazement the Jewish Christians present be-

* Cornelius belonged to that class of persons who are pointed out in John iii. 21. We are by no means authorized to maintain that Peter, from the general position laid down by him, intended to draw the inference naturally proceeding from it, that God would certainly lead to salvation those among all nations who possessed the traits here specified, even if they did not during their earthly life obtain a participation in redemption. He expressed that truth, which at the moment manifested itself to him in a consciousness enlightened by the Holy Spirit, without reflecting on all the consequences deducible from it. We must ever carefully distinguish between what enlightened men, speaking under certain historical conditions, with special reference to present circumstances, and according to interests immediately affected, consciously intend to say, and the contents, with all their deducible consequences, of that Eternal Truth, which, in some special application of it required by circumstances, they make use of. To develop the first is the province of exegesis and historical apprehension; the second, that of Christian doctrine and morals.

held their prejudices against the Gentiles controverted by the transaction itself. What an impression must it have made upon them, when they heard the Gentile, who had been considered by them as unclean, testify with such inspiration of Jehovah and the Messiah! And now Peter could appeal to this transaction, in order to nullify all the scruples of the Jews respecting the baptism of such uncircumcised persons, and ask, "Who can forbid water that these should be baptized, who have already received the baptism of the Spirit like ourselves?" And when he returned to Jerusalem, and the manner in which he had held intercourse with the Gentiles had raised a stumbling-block among the strict Pharisaical believers, he was able to silence them by a similar appeal. "Forasmuch then," said he, "as God gave them the like gift as he did unto us, who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, what was I, that I could withstand God?" Acts xi. 17.

BOOK III.

THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY AND FOUNDING OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH AMONG THE GENTILES BY THE INSTRUMENTALITY OF THE APOSTLE PAUL.

CHAPTER I.

PAUL'S PREPARATION AND CALL TO BE THE APOSTLE OF THE GENTILES.

WHEN anything new or great is to take place in the development of the kingdom of God, divine wisdom is wont so to order events that an impulse is given to its progress, not on one side only, but in several directions. Without being aware of it, the men whom God employs as his instruments co-operate from various stand-points, to prepare the way for that which, in the issue, is destined to effect a great revolution; threads which proceed, in the course of the world's history, from various points are made to meet at last in one. Beginnings are made and apparently fail; and yet what seemed to rise only to sink forever, finally becomes the victorious creative principle of a new illustrious epoch. So it was here.

Stephen appears to have been chosen in order that Christianity, freeing itself from the covering underneath which it had hitherto been developed, and bursting the forms of Judaism, might exhibit itself and show its power through him, as the principle of a new creation adapted to the whole human race; he died as a martyr for the great new idea first brought by him to light. But this idea did not die with him: it found other organs in those who were allied to him by descent and education, the Hellenists, who, while they extended their agency even to the Gentiles, realized in various small circles the intentions of Stephen. Then, from the midst of Palestinian Judaism itself, came forth Peter, who, from quite a different direction, and as it were against his will, was led by a combination of influences to vindicate the independent development of Christianity among the Gentiles. It might have been imagined that the more liberal Hellenistic culture would produce the man by whom the idea put forth by the Hellenistic Stephen was destined to be carried out in all its extent. But God likes to work by opposites, and very differently from the calculations of human pragmatism. There is a divine

impress stamped on the paradoxes which meet us in the development of the kingdom of God. Thus, not from the Alexandrian but from the Pharisaic school, that great man was to come forth, who was destined to represent Christianity in opposition to the Pharisaic conceptions to which it hitherto had been restricted. This new development was to emanate, not from what was kindred to it, but from that which was directly opposed to it. The Pharisee was to be transformed into the scribe of the kingdom of God. It was important that the new spirit should take to itself a form, not from the delicate shell of Hellenic culture, but from the hard kernel of Pharisaism. The solid Christian realism, as it was represented in Paul, could impress itself more distinctly on the hard substance of obstinate Pharisaism, than on the tender, yielding material of Hellenistic culture. And it was also not unimportant that in Paul the Hellenist element amalgamated with the Palestinian and Pharisaic. What had been effected in the development of Christianity by Stephen, by the Hellenists, and finally by Peter, was concentrated in him. If in the manner by which Peter, the advocate of the contracted Palestinian conception of Christianity, was led to more liberal views, there is found something analogous to the manner in which Paul was converted, from the most violent opposition to the Gospel, to the reception of it in its most comprehensive form, then we must regard it as an objective type of the historical process of development, proceeding according to the same law and with the same great outlines, and not as the arbitrary fiction of any human mind.

With what we have just now remarked is closely connected that which in the history of the development of Christianity especially distinguishes the Apostle Paul. It was not merely that churches were founded by him among the heathen, and that the sphere of his labors was so extensive; but also that by him especially, the fundamental truths of the Gospel were developed in their living, organic connection, and formed into a compact system; that the essence of the Gospel in relation to human nature, on one side especially, namely, its need of redemption, was set by him in the clearest light; so that when the sense of that need has been long repressed or perverted, and a revival of Christian consciousness has followed a state of spiritual death, the newly-awakened Christian life, whether in the church at large, or in individuals, has always drawn its principal nourishment from *his* writings. He has presented Christianity so specially under this aspect, has so expressly opposed the immediate relation of the religious consciousness to Christ, to dependence on all human mediation whatever, and has so distinctly separated from each other the Christian and Jewish stand-points, that among the apostles he must ever be considered as the representative of the Protestant principle. And history, though it furnishes only a few hints respecting the early life of Paul before his call to the apostleship, has recorded enough to make it evident, that by the whole course of his previous development he was fitted for what he was to become, and for what he was to effect.

Saul, or Paul (the former the original Hebrew, the latter the Hellenized form of his name,)* was a native of the city of Tarsus in Cilicia. This we learn from his own expressions in Acts xxi. 39; xxii. 3; and the contradictory tradition reported by Jerome, (de V. J. c. 5,) that he was born in the small town of Gischala, in Galilee, does not appear credible, though it is not improbable that his parents once resided there,† which

* The latter was his usual appellation from the time of his being devoted entirely to the conversion of the heathen; Acts xiii. 9. Although the ancient supposition, that he changed his own name for that of his convert Sergius Paulus, has been recently advocated by Meyer and Olshausen, I cannot approve of it. I cannot imagine that the conversion of a proconsul would be thought so much more of by him than the conversion of any other man (and he was far from being his first convert,) as to induce him to assume his name. It is more agreeable to the usage of ancient times, for the scholar to be named after his teacher, (as Cyprian after Cæcilius, Eusebius after Pamphilus,) than for the teacher to be named after the scholar; for no one now would think of finding a parallel in the instance of Scipio Africanus. And had this really been the reason why Paul assumed the name, we might have expected, as it was closely connected with the whole narrative, that Luke would have expressly assigned it. The more there may have been of design on the part of the author of the Acts in changing at this time the apostle's name from Saul to Paul—if, as Baur assumes, (p. 93,) it was an imitation of the alteration in Peter's name—the less likely is it that he would have introduced the new name at once, without any previous notice. And Fritzsche is correct in saying (see his Commentary on the Romans, Proleg. p. 11) that in this case, not Acts xiii. 9, but xiii. 13, would have been a natural place for mentioning it. Still, I cannot, with Fritzsche, think it probable that Luke was accidentally led, by the mention of Sergius Paulus, to remark that Paul also bore the same name. The most natural way of viewing the matter seems to be this: Luke had hitherto designated him by the name which he found in the memoirs lying before him on the early history of Christianity. But he was now induced to distinguish him by the name which he found in the memoirs of his labors among the heathen, and by which he had personally known him during that later period; and, therefore, took the opportunity of remarking, that this Paul was no other than the individual whom he had hitherto called Saul. Here, as in many other instances, we perceive the absence of design in the manner in which the Acts is made up from various accounts.

† If we were justified in understanding with Paulus (in his work on the Apostle Paul's Epistles to the Galatians and Romans, p. 323) the word *ἑβραῖος*, Phil. iii. 5, 2 Cor. xi. 22, as used in contradistinction to *ἑλληνιστής*, it would serve to confirm this tradition, since it would imply that Paul could boast of a descent from a Palestinian Jewish, and not Hellenistic family. But since Paul calls himself *ἑβραῖος*, though he was certainly by birth a Hellenist, it is evident that the word cannot be used in so restricted a sense; and in the second passage quoted above, where it is equivalent to an Israelite, a descendant of Abraham, it plainly has a wider meaning; see Bleek's admirable Introduction to the Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 32. This tradition, too, reported by Jerome, is, as Fritzsche justly remarks, very suspicious, not only on account of the gross anachronism which makes the taking of Gischala by the Romans the cause of Paul's removal thence with his parents,—since this event happened much later in the Jewish war,—but also because Jerome, in his Commentary on the Epistle to Philemon, (verse 23,) makes use of this tradition to explain why Paul, though a citizen of Tarsus, calls himself, 2 Cor. xi. 22, Philip. iii. 5, "*Hebræus ex Hebræis, et cætera quæ illum Judæum magis indicant quam Tarsensem,*" (a Hebrew of the Hebrews, and other things, which indicate that he was a native of Judea rather than of Tarsus,) which yet, as we have remarked above, proceeds only from a misunderstanding of the epithet which Paul applies to himself. Jerome must have, therefore, taken up this false account ("*talem fabulam accepimus,*"—we have received such a story—are his own words) without proof, in a very thoughtless manner.

may have given rise to the report. As we do not know how long he remained under the paternal roof, it is impossible to determine what influence his education in the metropolis of Cilicia (which, as a seat of literature, vied with Athens and Alexandria,)* had on his mental development. Certainly, his early acquaintance with the language and national peculiarities of the Greeks was not without influence in preparing him to be a teacher of Christianity among nations of Grecian origin. Yet the few passages from the Greek poets which we meet with in his discourse at Athens, and in his Epistles, do not prove that his education had made him familiar with Grecian literature; nor is it in itself probable that such would be the case, inasmuch as his parents designed him to be a teacher of the law, or Jewish theologian, and since his studies must have been confined in his early years to the Old Testament, and at about the age of twelve or thirteen he must have entered the school of Gamaliel.† It is possible, though considering Paul's intense Pharisaic zeal not probable, that the freer mode of thinking, and, in respect to Grecian literature, the liberal-mindedness of his teacher Gamaliel might have induced him even at Jerusalem, to turn his attention to Grecian letters. But might he not at a later period have been led, while exercising his ministry among people of Hellenic culture, to make himself better acquainted with Hellenic literature? The man who felt himself impelled by the glowing zeal of love, and who knew how to become as to the Jews a Jew, so to the Greeks a Greek, in order to win them over to the Gospel, might, for promoting that object, read many writings of the Grecian philosophers and poets. It may indeed be asked, whether he would have time, amidst his prodigious and varied labors, for such a purpose, having in addition to work for his livelihood? But can we venture to measure Paul by the common standard? It would not be easy to say what was not possible to such a man. Yet we must not draw too large a conclusion from the few passages of ancient authors which occur in his writings. It is true, we shall find in him expressions respecting the relation of Christianity to the culture and philosophy of the ancient world, to which the history of Grecian philosophy gives the best commentary, and which may perhaps give evidence of a deeper acquaintance with it. But what in others would be the result of study, might in Paul's case be sufficiently accounted for from the deep insight of his universal Christian philosophy. In the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and in the Epistle to the Romans,

* Strabo, who wrote in the time of Augustus, places Tarsus, in this respect, above those two cities: *τοσαύτη τοῖς ἐνθάδε ἀνθρώποις σπουδὴ πρὸς τε φιλοσοφίαν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἐγκύκλιον ἅπασαν παιδείαν γέγονεν, ὥσθ' ὑπερβέβληνται καὶ Ἀθήνας καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρειαν καὶ εἰ τινα ἄλλον τόπον δυνατόν εἰπεῖν, ἐν ᾧ σχολαὶ καὶ διατριβαὶ τῶν φιλοσόφων γέγονασι.* Geogr. i. 14, c. 5. (The men from that city had so great zeal for philosophy and the whole circle of arts and sciences, that they surpassed the people of Athens and Alexandria, and of any place that can be named, where there have been schools and discussions of philosophers).

† See Tholuck's admirable remarks in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1835, 2d No., p. 366.

he had several opportunities of making use of his knowledge of Grecian literature, if he had been familiar with it. And we know that an Apollos was his superior in Grecian culture, and that he calls himself "rude in speech," (*ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ*), 2 Cor. xi. 6, as compared with others.

But in the style of his representations, the Jewish element evidently predominates. His peculiar mode of argumentation was not formed in the Grecian, but in the Jewish school. The name Saul, שָׁאוּל,* the desired one, the one prayed for, perhaps indicates, that he was the first-born of his parents, granted in answer to their earnest prayers:† and hence it may be inferred, that he was devoted by his father, a Pharisee, to the service of religion, and sent in early youth to Jerusalem, that he might be trained to become a learned expounder of the law and of tradition; not to add, that it was usual for the youth of Tarsus‡ to complete their education at some foreign school. Most advantageously for him, he acquired in the Pharisaic schools at Jerusalem that systematic mental discipline, which afterwards rendered him such good service in developing the contents of the Christian doctrine; so that, like Luther, he became thoroughly conversant with the theological system, which afterwards, by the power of the gospel, he uprooted and destroyed. A youth so ardent and energetic as Paul, would throw his whole soul into whatever he undertook; his natural temperament would dispose him to an overflowing, impetuous zeal, and for such a propensity Pharisaism supplied abundant aliment.

The three great teachers of the church who were especially called to testify (in opposition to that carnality which first outwardly opposed Christianity, and afterward renewed the strife in the very midst of its development) to the antagonism between flesh and spirit, nature and grace, the natural and the supernatural, the merely natural human and the Christian—these three heroes of the Gospel, Paul, Augustin, and Luther, had in common, a fervid, powerful nature which could not easily be compelled, but would contend only the more strongly against reins and yoke, or any violence offered to it. But while in an Augustin the unbridled rude nature manifested itself in the outbreak of lust and passions unchecked by any higher power, and thus, in himself even, he learned to know the power of sin, it was otherwise with Paul as well as with Luther. The strict discipline of the law to which he had been subjected in the school of the Pharisees prevented the power of sin from breaking forth outwardly; it was driven back inwardly. Certainly he belonged to the earnest upright Pharisees who strove after the righteousness of the law with their whole souls. In the sight of men he appeared as righteous, blameless. As he himself could affirm that, "touching the righteousness which is in the law," he was "blameless,"

* We cannot attach much importance to so uncertain an inference.

† Like the names Theodorus, Theodoret, common among Christians in the first century

‡ See Strabo, l. c.

Phil. iii. 6, and "profited in the Jews' religion above many of his equals in age," Gal. i. 14. But the more earnestly he strove after holiness, the more he combated the refractory impulses of an ardent and powerful nature, which refused to be held in by the reins of the law, so much the more ample were his opportunities for understanding from his own experience the woful discord in human nature which arises when the moral consciousness asserts its claims as a controlling law, while the man feels himself constantly carried away, in defiance of his better longing and willing, by the force of ungodly inclination. Paul could not have depicted this condition so strikingly and to the life, in the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, if he had not gained the knowledge of it from personal experience. It was advantageous for him that he passed over to Christianity from a position where, by various artificial restraints and prohibitions, he had attempted to guard against the incursions of unlawful desires and passions, and to compel himself to goodness;* for thus he was enabled to testify from his own experience, (in which he appears as the representative of all men of deep moral feeling,) how deeply the sense of the need of redemption is grounded in the moral constitution of man; and thus likewise from personal experience, he could describe the relation of that inward freedom which results from faith in redemption, to the servitude of the legal stand-point. In his conflict with himself while a Pharisee, Paul's experiences resemble Luther's in the cloisters of Erfurt. Although in the Pharisaic dialectics and exposition of the law he was a zealous and faithful disciple of Gamaliel, we cannot from this conclude that he imbibed that spirit of moderation for which his master was so distinguished, and which he showed in his judgment of the new sect at the first, before it came into direct conflict with the theology of his party. For the scholar, especially a scholar of so powerful and peculiar a character, would imbibe the mental influences of his teacher, only so far as they accorded with the tendencies of his own spirit. His unyielding disposition, the fire of his nature, and the fire of his youth, made him a vehement persecuting zealot against all who opposed the system that was sacred in his eyes. Accordingly, no sooner did the new doctrine in the hands of Stephen assume a position opposed to the Pharisaic righteousness† of the law, an aspect hostile to Judaism,

* As, for example, from the stand-point of Pharisaism, it has been said, "Instead of leaving every thing to the free movements of the disposition, a man should force himself to do this or that good by a direct vow. Vows are the enclosures of holiness."

לְפָרְיִשׁוּת בְּדָרִים כִּי־ב. See Pirke Avoth. § 13.

† The question has been raised, whether Paul saw and heard Jesus during his earthly life? We have not the data for answering the question. In his Epistles, we find nothing conclusive either one way or the other. Olshausen thinks that it may be inferred from 2 Cor. v. 16, that Paul really knew Jesus during his earthly life *κατὰ σάρκα*. Paul, in that passage, he understands as saying, "But if I know Christ, as indeed I did know him, according to the flesh, in his bodily earthly appearance, yet now I know him so no more." Against this interpretation I will not object with Baur, in his Essay "On the Party of Christ in the Corinthian Church," in the *Tübingen Zeitschrift für Theologie*, 1831,

than he became its most vehement persecutor. After the martyrdom of Stephen, when many adherents of the gospel sought safety by flight, Paul felt himself called to counterwork them in the famed city of Damascus, where the new sect was gaining ground. And he hastened thither, after receiving full powers for committing all the Christians to prison, from the Sanhedrim, who, recognized by the Romans as the highest ecclesiastical authority among the Jews, were allowed to inflict all disciplinary punishment against the violators of the law.*

No. iv. p. 95, that he could not mean this, because it would have been undervaluing Christ in his state of humiliation, which would be in contradiction to those passages in which he attributes to that state the highest abiding importance, and says he is determined to know nothing save Christ and him crucified. For though the remembrance of Christ in the form of a servant could never vanish from his mind, though he never could forget what he owed to Christ the Crucified, yet now he knew him no longer as living in human weakness, and subject to death, but as having risen victoriously from death, the glorified one, now living in divine power and majesty; 2 Cor. xiii. 4. The relation in which it would have been possible to stand to Christ while he lived in the form of a servant on earth, could no longer exist. No one could now stand near to him, simply for being a Jew; no one could hold converse with him in an outward manner, as a being present to the senses; henceforth it was only possible to enter into union with Christ as the glorified one, as he presented himself to the religious consciousness in a spiritual, internal manner, by believing on him as crucified for the salvation of mankind. As respects that, therefore, Paul might well say that *now* there could no longer be for him such "a knowledge of Christ after the flesh." And we grant that he might have said *hypothetically*, If I had known Christ heretofore after the flesh, had I stood in any such outward communion with him as manifest in the flesh, yet *now* such a communion has lost all its importance for me (such a value as those Judaizers attribute to it who make it the sign of genuine apostleship); but now I know Christ after the spirit, like all those who enjoy spiritual communion with him. But Paul could only say this in a purely hypothetical way, supposing something to be which really was not; for allowing that he had seen and heard Jesus with his bodily senses, his opponents would have been far from attaching any importance to *such* seeing and hearing as could have been affirmed with equal truth of many Jews, who stood in an indifferent or even hostile position towards Christ. The reference in this passage can be only to such a "knowing of Christ after the flesh," as belonged to the other apostles, since only to this from any religious stand-point whatever could there be attached a value against which Paul might have felt himself called to protest. For this reason I must agree with Baur, who understands *χριστός* here, not of the person of Jesus, but of the Messiah, a Messiah known in a carnal way, as from the early Jewish stand-point. I also believe with Baur, that if Paul had intended a personal reference, he would have said *Ἰησοῦν χριστόν*, and I cannot admit the force of the objection which Olshausen makes to this interpretation, that it would require the article before *χριστόν*, for in designating the Messiah absolutely, the article might be omitted, just as Demosthenes speaking of the Persian king, to designate the king absolutely, uses the word *βασιλεὺς* without the article.

* If Damascus at that time still belonged to a Roman province, the Sanhedrim could exercise its authority there, in virtue of the right secured every where to the Jews to practise their worship in their own manner. If the city was brought under the government of the Arabian King Aretas, the Sanhedrim could still reckon on his support, in consequence of the connexion he had formed with the Jews; perhaps he himself had gone over to Judaism. The Jews in Damascus could also exercise great influence by means of the women, who were almost all converts to Judaism. Josephus, *De Bell. Jud.* ii. 20, 2.

As respects the great mental change which Paul experienced in the course of this journey undertaken for the extinction of the Christian faith, what has been said concerning the history of the conversion of Cornelius might certainly be applied here also ; and so the supposition is possible that the event strikes us as sudden and marvellous, only because the history records the mere fact, without the various preparatory and connecting circumstances which led to it ; and hence by making use of the hints which the narrative furnishes to fill up the outline, we may gain the explanation of the whole on purely natural principles.

Paul (it would be said by a person adopting this view of the event) had received many impressions which disturbed the repose of his truth-loving soul ; he had heard the temperate counsels of his revered instructor Gamaliel ; he had listened to the address of Stephen to whom he was allied by natural temperament, and had witnessed his martyrdom. But he was still too deeply imbued with the spirit of Pharisaism to surrender himself to these impressions, so contrary to the prevailing bent of his mind. He forcibly repressed them ; he rejected the thoughts that involuntarily rose in his mind in favor of the new doctrine, as the suggestions of Satan, whom he regarded as the sole contriver of this rebellion against the authority of the ancient traditions, and he accordingly set himself with so much the greater ardor against the new sect. Yet he could not succeed altogether in suppressing these rising thoughts, and in silencing the voice of conscience, which rebuked his fanaticism. A conflict arose in his soul. While in this state, an outward impression was added, which brought the internal process to maturity. Not far from Damascus he and his followers were overtaken by a violent storm ; the lightning struck near to Paul, and he fell senseless to the ground. He attributed this catastrophe to the avenging power of the Messiah, whom in the person of his disciples he was persecuting, and confounding the objective and subjective, he converted this internal impression into an outward appearance of Christ to him ; blinded by the lightning, and stunned, he came to Damascus. But admitting this explanation as correct, how is the meeting of Paul with Ananias to be explained by natural causes ? Even here many particulars which are not expressly mentioned in the narrative might be supplied. Since Ananias was noted even among the Jews as a man of strict legal piety, it is not improbable that he and Paul were previously acquainted with one another at Jerusalem. At all events, Paul had heard of the extraordinary spiritual gifts said to be possessed by Ananias, and the thought naturally arose in his mind, that a man held in so much repute among the Christians, might be able to heal him, and restore him from his present unfortunate condition ; and while occupied with this thought, his imagination formed it into a vision. On the other hand, we may suppose, that Ananias had heard something of the great change that had taken place in Paul ; and yet did not give full credence to the report, till a vision, explicable on similar psychological principles, had overcome his mistrust.

In reference to this explanation, we must certainly allow that what appears in the Acts as immediately miraculous, might have been prepared for psychologically, in the manner we have unfolded, but nothing in the narrative indicates either the necessity or probability of such a preparation. We can by no means conclude from the original, fundamental features of the Pauline character, from its general susceptibility to the true and the good, that the sight of the martyrdom of a Stephen would necessarily deeply impress, and at last master the soul which was fortified against it. History furnishes us with numerous examples of the power of religious fanaticism over minds that in other respects have been susceptible of the true and the good, and yet while under its influence, have used those very things to confirm them in their delusion, which might seem fitted to rescue them from it; as many pious men were witnesses of the martyrdom of Huss, who died in a manner similar to Stephen, and yet only saw in it the blindness of one infatuated by his self-conceit. It is, therefore, quite consistent with the powerful character of Paul to believe that, in the martyrdom of Stephen, he saw only the power of the evil spirit over the mind of one who had been seduced from the pure faith of his fathers; and that hence he felt a stronger impulse to counterwork the propagation of a doctrine which could involve in such ruin men distinguished by their character and their talents. Besides, if the impression which a storm, conjoined with these preparatory circumstances, made upon him, alone formed the groundwork of that vision of Christ, it is unaccountable that Paul's followers also believed that they perceived something similar to what befel him; for this is only admissible, if we suppose them to have been like-minded with Paul, which could not be unless they were already Christians, or on the way to Christianity. But such persons would hardly attach themselves to a persecutor of Christians.*

Such attempts at explaining the narrative are suspicious, because these not unusual natural appearances are made use of to bring down what is extraordinary into the circle of common events. Instead, there-

* The variations in the narrative of these events contained in Acts ix., xxii. and xxvi., prove nothing against the reality of the fact. Such unimportant differences might easily arise in the repetition of the narrative of an event so far removed from the circle of ordinary occurrences; and these differences need not be attributed to alteration in the narrative by Paul himself, but may be supposed to have originated in the incorrectness of others in repeating it. As for the rest, if we assume that his attendants received only a general impression of the phenomenon, not so definite as Paul's, for whom it was mainly intended; that they saw a light, but no precise shape or figure; that they heard a voice, without distinguishing or understanding the words; it is easy to perceive that various representations would naturally be given of the event. As this phenomenon, from its very nature, cannot be judged of according to the laws of ordinary earthly communications and perceptions, the difference in the perceptions of Paul and his attendants argues nothing against its objective reality. We are too ignorant of the laws which regulate the communications between a higher spiritual world and men living in a world of the senses, to determine anything precisely on these points.

fore, of following this explanation which is attended with great difficulties—we might rather conceive the whole, independently of all outward phenomena, as an inward transaction in Paul's mind, a spiritual revelation of Christ to his higher self-consciousness; and, in this light, we might view the experiences which he had in his conflicts with himself while a Pharisee, and the impression of the discourse and martyrdom of Stephen, as forming a preparation by which his heart was rendered capable of receiving these internal revelations of the Redeemer. But this inward transaction may be conceived of in two ways, the difference of which is determined by a difference in the conception of Christianity itself, and of the person of Christ especially, and by the still more general difference in the mode of contemplating God and the Universe. It may be so understood as to exclude the supernatural altogether, while everything is considered only as the result of natural, psychological development. For the living Christ, who reveals himself to the spirit, is substituted the power of an idea which through him is excited in the human spirit, or the shining forth of which in the consciousness of the spirit the first impulse has been given by him. What represented itself as Christ to the spirit of Paul, is only the symbolical vision of this idea involuntarily transferred to a definite person, who served as a foil for it. What appeared to the spirit as something external, is nothing else than the reflection of what proceeded from his own inward being. Such a conception as this, which makes Christianity and Christ totally different objects from what they were to Paul, which regards as self-deception what inspired him, what was the soul of his life, his thinking and his acting, and gave him his power for everything—such a conception we must most emphatically reject. But something altogether different is a spiritual inward revelation of Christ as a real fact, in the same sense as Paul would regard it, and as Christ promised to his disciples; not the coming into consciousness of an idea, but a revelation of the same Christ in his glorified personality, by whom in his earthly manifestation the salvation of mankind had been effected, and with whom believers must come into a real relation. But if we regard this only as a spiritual, inward transaction proceeding from the contact of the higher self-consciousness with the living Christ, and that which represented itself to the outward senses only as a reflection of that revelation which took place in the inner man—by such an apprehension, the divine and the truth of the event would lose nothing. At all events, that inward revelation of Christ is always the chief thing, and however we may conceive of the appearance outwardly recognisable to the senses, it was still only the means of leading him to that inward revelation of Christ, to prepare him for that real spiritual communion with the living Christ, from which his whole apostolic efficiency proceeded; as among the earlier apostles the reappearance of Christ after his resurrection was only the preparation for the ever-enduring communion, into which they would enter with Christ. The perceptions of the senses cannot have greater certainty and

reality than the facts of a higher self-consciousness, whereby a man receives revelations of an order of things in which his true life has its root, far above the sensible world, which he experiences and apprehends spiritually. And that this was no self-illusion, capable of being psychologically explained, that extraordinary change would testify which was the result in Paul of this internal transaction, as would also the whole course of his apostolic ministry, which may be traced to this inward experience, as the effect to its cause. But likewise the manner in which his attendants were affected by what happened on this occasion contradicts the supposition of a merely internal transaction, even if we could resolve on ascribing the state, in which Paul came to Damascus to the power of an internal impression.*

But if it be not allowed that the narrative in the Acts is trustworthy, yet the testimony of Paul himself in reference to this event, from which he always dates the commencement of a new era in his life, must be met. As he often in his Epistles refers to it in opposition to his Jewish adversaries, who were unwilling to acknowledge him as an apostle; so he had a confident persuasion that the apostolic commission was given him by Christ in the same manner as to the other apostles; this is expressed most fully and strongly in Gal. i. 1. Yet here we need not suppose an outward event to be meant, but may understand it of an internal transaction such as we have described. In the sixteenth verse, Paul evidently speaks of an internal communication of Christ, of an inward revelation of him to his self-consciousness,† whereby, independently of all human instruction, he was qualified to preach Christ. But if we allow that from these words of Paul nothing can be concluded with certainty, excepting an inward revelation of Christ which he was conscious of having received, yet we can by no means grant that all his other expressions respecting this transaction are to be explained according to this passage, and consequently that there is only that pure internal revelation lying at the basis of everything else that he reports. By mentioning in this passage only the one particular of highest interest, he by

* The notion, that the vision which immediately preceded Paul's conversion is the one described by himself in 2 Cor. xii. 2, which in modern times has been revived by several distinguished theologians, has everything against it: in the latter, Paul describes his elevation in spirit to a higher region of the spiritual world; in the vision which occasioned his conversion, there was a revelation of Christ coming down to him while consciously living on the earth. The immediate impression of the first was humiliating; the second was connected with an extraordinary mental elevation. With the first his Christian consciousness began; the second marked one of the most exalted moments of his inward life, after he had long lived in communion with Christ; and by such a foretaste of heavenly existence, he was refreshed under his manifold conflicts, and animated to renew his earthly labors. The date of fourteen years mentioned here, is of no chronological use, further than to satisfy us, that the date of Paul's conversion, fixed at exactly fourteen years previous to the writing of this, must be false.

† It is most natural to understand the phrase "in me" *ἐν ἐμοί*, as denoting something internal.

no means excludes all others ; but it suited his purpose and aim to make this one thing prominent, since he wished simply to point out the independent source from which he drew his knowledge of Christian truth. And in this connection, the way in which Christ appeared outwardly to him was a matter of comparative indifference. It is evident, that whatever that way might have been, there was no occasion to mention it here. But it is another particular which Paul makes prominent in 1 Cor. ix. 1, when he adduces his having seen Christ as a pledge of his genuine apostolic dignity.* It could be only such a seeing of Christ, which could have this importance attached to it. It belonged to the apostolic calling to testify of Christ the Risen One from a personal sight of him. Because Christ had been seen by Paul, he stood in this respect on an equality with the other apostles ; and in the 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians he evidently places the appearance of the risen and glorified Saviour, which was vouchsafed to himself, in the same category with all his other appearances after his resurrection. Hence we see how important it was for him, as well as for the other apostles, to be able to testify *from personal experience* of the great fact—the basis of Christian faith and hope—*of the real resurrection of Christ and his glorified personal existence.* Hence

* It must be evident to every unprejudiced person, that this cannot refer to Paul's having seen Jesus during his earthly life, (though a possible occurrence,) for it would have added nothing to his apostolic authority ; nor yet to the mere knowledge of the doctrine of Christ. Rückert, in his Com. on this passage, maintains that it refers rather to one of the appearances of Christ, which were granted to him in a state of ecstatic vision, Acts xviii. 9, xxii. 17, than to that which occasioned his conversion, especially since an appearance of Christ on that occasion, is not mentioned either in Acts ix., xxii., xxvi., nor in Gal. i. 12–16. On the other hand, the following considerations deserve attention. Since, as Rückert himself acknowledges, the reading in that passage is to be preferred, in which the words, "Am I not an apostle?" are immediately followed by, "Have I not seen Christ?" we may infer that Paul adduced his having seen Christ as a confirmation of his apostleship ; as afterwards for the same purpose, he adduces the success of his efforts in founding the Corinthian church. Without doubt, he urged this against his Judaizing opponents, who disputed his call to the apostleship on the ground, that he had not been appointed by Christ himself like the other apostles. In this connection it is most natural to expect, that Paul would speak of that appearance of Christ which marked the commencement of his apostolic career, that real appearance of Christ which he classes with the other appearances of the risen Saviour, 1 Cor. xv. 8, and not a mere vision. Rückert indeed maintains, that Paul made no distinction between the two kinds of appearances, for "otherwise he could have attributed no value to visions, regarding them as mere figments of the imagination." But this conclusion is not correct ; for between a real objective appearance, and a natural creation of the imagination formed in the usual psychological manner, we can conceive of another manner of appearance—one produced by an operation of the Divine Spirit on the higher self-consciousness, in virtue of which what is inwardly apprehended presents itself to the person so influenced under a sensible image ; whereby the imagination is transformed into an organ for what is apprehended through the operation of the Divine Spirit. That such a communication of the Divine Spirit is distinguished both from a real appearance to the senses, and from a mere creation of the imagination, is evident from many passages of Holy Writ, as for example, Peter's vision, Acts x. 12. But the word "no one," *μηδένα*, not "nothing," *μηδέν*, Acts ix. 7, certainly implies, that Paul, in distinction from his attendants, had seen *a person*.

the image of the glorified Christ is present to his contemplation when he testifies of the revelation of the glory of God in Christ, and speaks of that perfect conformity to his image to which believers will hereafter attain. But may not what we have before said in the case of Cornelius be made use of as an argument against the objective reality of this appearance of Christ? May it not be said—as Cornelius could only testify of his own subjective experience of what he *believed* that he had seen, so it might have been with Paul; he believed that he had seen the risen and glorified Christ; as far as he tells us of his experience, he is trustworthy; but it does not therefore appear that he was capable of distinguishing between the objective and the subjective; hence we are not at all justified in supposing anything else than the inward vision. But the comparison is not altogether correct. In reference to what was communicated to Cornelius, it is not a point of importance whether it was a real angelic appearance, or a vision. The importance of the transaction, for himself, and in a religious view, remains just the same. On the contrary, the importance of what was seen by Paul, consists in this—that he had actually seen the risen and glorified Christ, and that he could testify from his own beholding and experience of that resurrection and glorification, which was the foundation of his whole religious faith. His believing confidence would have risen from self-deception, if we admit that he had here confounded the objective and the subjective. We can not bring ourselves to admit this, if we hold in due esteem this belief of Paul, and what he effected by means of it for the salvation of men. Besides, we are justified in placing greater confidence in a Paul than in a Cornelius, for forming a correct judgment respecting himself. Paul, who knew by experience the state of ecstasy, could well distinguish it from the state of waking and thoughtful religious consciousness, as we may learn from the passage above quoted in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians.

But in truth, a transaction of this kind can never be proved in a manner that will be universally satisfactory. In order to be recognised in its reality, it must be regarded from a peculiar point of view; and whoever is a stranger to this, must struggle against admitting the fact. For history in general there is no such thing as mathematical demonstration. Faith and trust are always required for the recognition of historical truth. The only question is, whether there is sufficient ground for it, or more which prompts to doubt. The decision depends upon the understanding of the facts, and of the whole department to which they belong. The occasion for doubt is stronger in proportion as the nature of the transactions in question, and of their peculiar realm, is something foreign to the spirit of the inquirer, and as these facts, outside the circle of his experience, are less capable of being decided according to the standard he is familiar with. This remark applies particularly to transactions which follow other laws than those of the common course of nature, and in which something supernatural is involved. Whoever

thinks that everything must be explained by natural laws, and is necessitated to acknowledge nothing supernatural by his whole philosophical system, will feel himself compelled to refer the history of Paul's conversion to those common laws, and to deny everything that opposes them; it would be in vain to dispute with him about special points, when the underlying principle of his whole theory has predetermined the course of his inquiry and its result. Especially in the explanation of the transaction of which we are here speaking, it is of consequence in what relation the inquirer is placed to that on which the essence of the Christian faith rests, and with which it stands or falls—the *fact of the actual resurrection of Christ*. Whoever acknowledges this, occupies a position where he can have no motive to deny the supernatural in the history that is connected with that fact. Such a person can have no ground for mistrusting the expressions of Paul respecting this appearance to him of the risen Saviour. But whoever from his own point of view cannot acknowledge the actual resurrection of Christ, is so far incapacitated for admitting the objective nature of this appearance to Paul, and must from the first stand in a hostile relation to it.

But yet, it is always important that we do not separate what God has joined together; that we do not tear asunder the connection between the objective and the subjective, the divine and human, the supernatural and the natural. We by no means suppose a magical influence on Paul, by which he was carried away, and converted against his will. According to the view we have taken of this event, we suppose an internal point of connection, without which no outward revelation or appearance could have become an inward one; without which any outward impression that could have been made, however powerful, would have been transient in its results. In his case, the love for the true and the good lying underneath his errors, and repressed by the power of his passions and prejudices, was to be set free from its thralldom only by a mighty influence. No miracle whatever could have converted a Caiaphas into a preacher of the gospel.

It might be expected that Paul could not at once, after such an impression, enter on a new course of action. Everything which hitherto had been the motive and aim of his conduct must for a time have seemed as nothing. Contrition must have been the predominant feeling of his crushed spirit. He could not instantaneously recover from so overwhelming an impression, which gave a new direction to his whole being. He was reduced to a state of mental and bodily weakness, from which he could not restore himself. He passed three days without food. This was for him the point of transition from death to a new life; and nothing can so vividly express his feelings at this awful crisis, as the exclamation which he himself, reverting to his earlier state, Rom. vii. 24, puts in the lips of the man who, with the deepest consciousness of inward slavery under the law, and with earnest aspirations after freedom, pours forth

his whole heart in the words, "O, wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me?" Nor is it at all probable that, in this state, he would seek for social intercourse. Nothing could less agree with his feelings than intercourse with the Jews; nor could he easily prevail on himself to seek out the Christians, whom he had hitherto persecuted. To a man in this state of mind nothing could be so welcome as solitude. Hence it is in itself by no means probable that information of the great change that had passed upon him would be conveyed by other persons to Ananias. It is worthy of notice that, in order to attain to a full consciousness of his new life, and to make the transition from this intermediate state of contrition to a new life of active exertion in communion with Christ, he had to be brought into connection with the existing Christian church by the instrumentality of one of its members. In communion with other believers, he first obtained what he could not find in his solitude. When he prayed to Christ who had appeared to him, that he would help him in his distress, that he would enlighten both his bodily and spiritual eyes, it was promised to him in a vision that a well-known enlightened man, belonging to the church at Damascus, whom he probably knew by name and sight, should be the instrument of his spiritual and bodily restoration. When Ananias, in obedience to a divine call, visited him, Paul recognized the person to whom the vision had referred him, and hence felt immediate confidence in him; in communion with him he was now first to be made partaker of a new and higher principle of life. Ananias introduced Paul to the other Christians in the city. After he had been strengthened by spending several days in their society, he felt himself impelled to enter the synagogues, and testify in behalf of that cause which heretofore he had so fiercely persecuted.* Whether he considered it best, after bearing this first testimony among the Jews, to allow its impression to work silently on their minds, without personally attempting to enforce it, or whether the plots of the Jews induced him to quit the place, we are not certain: be this as it may, he visited the neighboring parts of Arabia. The question here arises, With what view, and for what object, did Paul visit Arabia? He perhaps found an opening for preaching the Gospel among the numerous Jews who were scattered over Arabia, and devoted his activity to that object. He would here,

* It is difficult to consider "certain days," *ἡμέραι τινές*, in Acts ix. 19, and "many days," *ἡμέραις ἱκαναῖς*, in the 23d verse, as equivalent terms. Yet it cannot be proved from these words that Luke by the latter meant to show a break in Paul's residence at Damascus, occasioned by a journey into Arabia, but the succession of events as narrated in the Acts, is most naturally understood thus: The "certain days" merely expresses the few days which Paul, just after his baptism, spent in the fellowship of the Christians at Damascus; with this is closely connected the *καὶ εὐθέως*, "and straightway," after he had spent some days with the disciples, he entered into the synagogues; and the "many days" denote the whole succeeding period of Paul's stay at Damascus. Within this whole period of "many days," of which nothing more is told in the Acts, we must place Paul's journey into Arabia, of which we should not have known but for the mention of it in the Epistle to the Galatians.

therefore, first of all have appeared as an apostle to the Jews. But the reason might be that he felt impelled to prepare himself in quiet retirement for the great office entrusted to him by a divine call. On merely internal grounds the question cannot be decided. It is quite as possible that the man of glowing zeal and unwearied activity would feel himself impelled to testify immediately among the Jews of that truth to which he had hitherto been an enemy, as that after such an astonishing convulsion of his inner life a season of contemplative repose would form the transition-point and preparation for his great activity. And the connection in which this statement occurs in the Epistle to the Galatians is not decisive of the question; for either view equally suits the antithesis in that passage, that Paul did not go up to Jerusalem in order to make his appearance under the sanction of those who were apostles before him.

From Arabia he returned again to Damascus. Whether the Jews, whose anger he had already excited by his former preaching, as soon as they heard of his coming, endeavored to lay hold of a person who was so capable of injuring Judaism; or whether they were first exasperated by his renewed addresses in their synagogues, he was obliged to consult his safety by flight, as his life was threatened by their machinations. So far was this man, who shunned no danger in his subsequent career, though now in the first glow of conversion, a season when the mind is generally most prone to extravagance—so far was he from indulging in that enthusiastic ardor which seeks and craves martyrdom!* He was let down by his friends in a basket through the window of a house, built against the wall of the city, that he might escape unnoticed by the Jews, who were lying in wait for him at the gates. After three years had thus expired from the time of his conversion,† he resolved, about the year 39,‡

* “The glorying in infirmities,” (among which he reckons this flight,) τὰ τῆς ἀσθενείας καυχᾶσθαι, is one feature in his character which distinguished him from enthusiasts: 2 Cor. xi. 30.

† Three years after his conversion, namely, on the supposition that the *terminus a quo* the years are reckoned in the passage of the Epistle to the Galatians, is the date of his conversion.

‡ This circumstance in Paul's life furnishes one of the few chronological marks for its history. When Paul fled from Damascus three years after his conversion, that city was under the government of King Aretas of Arabia Petræa, 2 Cor. xi. 32. But since Damascus belonged to a Roman province, Aretas must have been in possession of this city under very peculiar circumstances. Süsskind, in his essay in Bengel's *Archiv.* 1. 2. p. 314; Wurm, in his essay on the chronology of Paul's life, in the *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie* 1833, 1st No. p. 27; and Anger, de temporum in Actis ratione, p. 181, agree in thinking that we are not quite justified in admitting that Aretas was at that time in possession of Damascus, as it is a conclusion no wise favored by other historical accounts; for if Damascus was then under the Roman government, the Ethnarch of Aretas might have ventured to place a watch before the gates of the city, or, through his influence with the Roman authorities, have obtained permission for the Jews to do this. Yet it is difficult to believe that, if Damascus belonged to a Roman province, the Arabian Ethnarch would have ventured to surround the city with a watch in order to get a Roman citizen into his power; or, that the Roman authorities would have allowed of his doing so, or at his request have exposed a Roman

once more to return to Jerusalem.* As to the object of this journey, it follows from what Paul himself states, in his Epistle to the Galatians, (i. 18,) that the main object at least, was not to form a connexion with the Christian church in Jerusalem, but to become per-

citizen to the wrath of the Jews. Although the history, in which there are, besides, so many breaks, does not inform us of such a taking of Damascus, yet a consideration of this passage leads to that supposition. Now the circumstances by which Aretas may have gained possession of the city were perhaps these: The Emperor Tiberias, as the ally of King Herod Agrippa, whose army had been defeated by Aretas, commanded Vitellius, the governor of Syria, to get possession of him either dead or alive. But while Vitellius was preparing to execute these orders, and various circumstances were delaying his entering on the campaign, news arrived of the emperor's death, which took place in March of the year 37, and Vitellius was thus stopped in his military movements. Aretas might have taken advantage of this interval to gain possession of the city. But it is not to be assumed that the city, thus snatched from the Romans, remained long in his hands, and it is probable that, as in the second year of the reign of the Emperor Caligula, A. D. 38-39, the affairs of Arabia were settled, Damascus also was not left unnoticed. If we place the flight of Paul from Damascus in 39, then his conversion must have been in A. D. 36, since it must have occurred three years before, and we also fix the same date for Stephen's martyrdom. From the absence of chronological information respecting the events of those times, we cannot fix with certainty the date of Paul's conversion: yet the computation which places it in A. D. 36 has this in its favor, that it allows neither too long nor too short a time for the events which took place in the Christian Church, from the period of Christ's ascension to the martyrdom of Stephen and the conversion of Paul.

* The accounts scattered through the Pauline epistles, and the narrative in the Acts should here be compared. Baur, in his often-mentioned work on Paul, thinks he has discovered an inexplicable contradiction between them. The question is, whether the agreement or the discrepancy between these two-sided accounts is greater. They agree in this, that Paul, after his conversion, did not at first return to Jerusalem, (not feeling himself pressed, as might be supposed he would, to testify for Christianity, where he had before been its persecutor,) but remained a long time in Damascus, and only thence betook himself to Jerusalem. They also agree, except in trifling particulars, in their statements that Paul was compelled to leave Damascus. Paul himself says, 2 Cor. xi. 32, that the governor under King Aretas of Arabia, "kept the city with a garrison, desirous to apprehend" him, that he was let down in a basket through an opening in the wall, and so escaped the hands of his enemies. In Acts ix. 24, it is stated that the Jews lying in wait for Paul watched the gates, in order to slay him if he should leave the city, but that the Christians let him down at night in a basket through the wall. It is evident that there is here an exact agreement between the two accounts, each completing and explaining the other; for those who stirred up Aretas or the governor against Paul could have been no other than the Jews embittered by his apostasy. And now the discrepancies are, first, an omission; the failure to mention the residence in Arabia, of which we learn in the Epistle to the Galatians. It may be that the author of the account in the Acts did not know of Paul's residence in Arabia, or that it did not seem to him of sufficient importance to mention it; either of which might the more easily be the case if Paul led there a quiet, retired life; on which supposition it is the more easily understood why so little was known at Jerusalem of what had become of this earlier persecutor of the Christians. This omission can the less be regarded as a mark of untrustworthiness, as the words "many days," (ix. 23,) point to an interval in which something like this residence in Arabia could have occurred. It is evident, that he who wrote it knew nothing definitely about the beginning of the interval over which he hastens; but we find no disagreement with the dates mentioned by Paul himself. The second discrepancy is also a partial omission; Paul says, in the Epistle to the Galatians, that he journeyed to Jeru-

sonally acquainted with the apostle Peter. This does not exclude what we are told in the Acts, of his intercourse with the whole church, and his disputations with the Hellenists; only these did not form the object for undertaking the journey, but only something additional while carrying out his original design. But it may be asked, Why was Paul so anxious to become personally acquainted with Peter? If Peter was allied to Paul by the fire of an outwardly directed activity, yet, on the other hand, John, by the deep inward element, the contemplative tendency of his spirit seems yet more closely allied to him. Paul might, therefore, from various considerations and motives desire to be personally acquainted both with Peter and John. But the characteristic qualities of John's mind appear not to have been prominently brought into action till a later period. Peter, in virtue of his peculiar "gift of government," *χάρισμα κυβερνήσεως*, and the position in which he had been placed by the Lord himself, had from the first taken the lead in all that related to the government of the church. He especially was active in promoting the spread of Christianity—a sufficient reason why Paul, before entering on his public ministry, should wish to confer with him in particular. If Paul had already attained a clear insight into the principles according to which he founded the Christian church among the Gentiles, a subject closely connected with these, namely, the relation of the Gospel to the Law, might have formed the topic of discussion between them. Among the reasons which led him to wish for a personal acquaintance with Peter, might have been the desire to know more exactly what he thought upon this subject. Although it was not till Paul had already gained an independent sphere of action, that a full conference took place between them on the relation of the different spheres of apostolic service and mode of operation, yet this does not render it impossible that at this first interview between Peter and Paul, they conversed on what was essential for the founding of a Christian church. Now if, as is very likely, the conversion of Cornelius had already taken place, we may also presume that Peter by what had then occurred was prepared to acknowledge the principles laid down by Paul. But if the contrary was the fact, the conference with Paul might have been one of those influential circumstances by which the conflict in Peter's mind that terminated at the conversion of Cornelius, was brought to its final result. In the first case, Peter might have acted as a mediator between Paul and James, the brother of the Lord, who in this respect stood furthest from Paul. It is remarkable, that these were the only leaders (*Coryphæi*) of the church with whom he at first came in contact.

But here another question arises. Was it purely accidental, that Paul

saalem the first time, not to learn from the apostles there the true Christian doctrine, but only to make the personal acquaintance of Peter, and that, therefore, he remained only fourteen days, and saw none of the apostles except James, the brother of the Lord. In the Acts his journey to Jerusalem is mentioned, but not the object of it, which perhaps was not known to the author.

met with but one apostle and one apostolic man? Did he avoid an interview with the collective church and with the rest of the apostles? On this supposition we must regard the narrative in the Acts on this point as erroneous. But what design could Paul have had in so acting? Shall we seek for the reason in what he says in the Epistle to the Galatians, that he wished to avoid the appearance of not having from the first entered independently on the preaching of the Gospel, and of having been instructed and furnished with full powers for it by the apostles? But this appearance would be produced as much, if not more, by seeking a conference with the two pillars of the church. If Paul had wished sedulously to avoid everything which might occasion such an appearance, he would not have gone at all to Jerusalem. Only one supposition remains, that Paul did not show himself openly, but merely conferred in secret with Peter, on account of his personal safety, in order to avoid the plots of his embittered enemies among the Jews; and that through Peter he met with James in the same private manner. This supposition might be confirmed by Paul's representation in the above mentioned passage of the Epistle to the Galatians, that, for fourteen years (or eleven years after this journey) he had been quite unknown by sight to the churches in Judea, and that they had only heard of him by report. But this would lead us to declare several things in the narrative of the Acts respecting this visit of Paul to Jerusalem untrue;* at all events we could not regard the account that Barnabas† introduced Paul to the apostles in general as perfectly accurate, since Paul, according to his own statement, met only with Peter.‡ If Paul at that time, in order to evade the plots of the Jews embittered against him for his apostasy, had been induced to remain in secret with Peter without showing himself openly, it follows that the report of the change that had taken place in his character must have already been widely spread in Jerusalem. But this being presupposed, it cannot be admitted that the Christians in Jerusalem were filled with mistrust against him, nor could he have needed the friendly offices of Barnabas to gain admission to the church. It is also, in itself, highly improbable, that the conversion of such an adversary, which was accomplished too in so remarkable a manner, should not have become known after so long an interval among the Christians

* Here we must, therefore, in truth acknowledge that Baur's doubts are not altogether unfounded, although we cannot acknowledge the decisive tone of his assertions to be equally well-founded, and at all events we can only admit an accidental error of tradition, which nowise affects the general truth of the narration, and implies no designed fabrication for a special purpose.

† According to an account not sufficiently authenticated, in the Hypotyposes of Clement of Alexandria in Eusebius, (*Hist. Eccles.* ii. 1,) Barnabas had been one of the seventy disciples.

‡ But this erroneous statement involves only an ignorance of particular circumstances; for as soon as it was known that Paul had made his first visit to the church at Jerusalem, without an acquaintance with the peculiar circumstances under which it took place, the assumption might be easily made, that he was then introduced to the apostles in general.

in Jerusalem.* And if only such a concealed visit of Paul to Jerusalem be admitted, the disputations between him and the Hellenists could not have taken place. Certainly this supposition has several things in its favor, but even admitting it, the credibility of the Acts in all essential points would still remain unshaken. From this one mistake, that the visit of Paul to Jerusalem instead of a private, was represented as a public one, other mistakes would follow without occasioning what might justly be called an essential deviation from historical truth. Meanwhile, we do not yet venture to maintain this, since many adjustments can be conceived between the two accounts, by which they supply each other's deficiencies.

We cannot certainly contradict the assertion, that Paul's conversion must have been already generally known in Jerusalem. It might lessen the difficulty if we consider that the young man Saul could not at that time have attained to such great eminence, that the greater part of those three years after his conversion had been spent in retirement in Arabia, and that his return was rendered difficult by political occurrences—the war with King Aretas. But it might be also, that Barnabas aided him by his good offices, though not for the precise object of removing the mistrust of the believers. He might have applied to him as to a Hellenist, one of his old acquaintances, and through him have been introduced to Peter. In itself it is perfectly natural that he should have first resorted to those Christians who stood nearest to him by descent, and perhaps by early acquaintance. Thus it might easily happen that, although he had not yet come in contact with the whole Church, he had had intercourse with many Hellenists, and through them was involved in those disputations which led to the persecutions afterwards raised against him.

But in reference to these disputations of Paul with the Hellenists, questions suggest themselves which we must examine before we proceed any further with the consideration of his life and labors:—the question, whether Paul from the beginning occupied that peculiar point of view which he held afterwards on the opposition between the Law and the Gospel, and in accordance with this had resolved to present Christianity to the Gentiles in its independent development, separate from Judaism, or whether such a tendency was formed in his mind by the opposition his preaching met with from a hostile Judaism—the question, from what influences the development of this peculiarly Pauline element is to be deduced; and this question, again, is connected with the more general one, respecting the sources to which Paul was indebted for his knowledge of Christian truth.

In passing over from Pharisaism to Christianity, it would very commonly happen that dependence on the authority of the Mosaic Law as a matter of perpetual obligation would be retained. This would be the case in conversions effected by ordinary instrumentality. But

* As Baur especially notices.

it was altogether different with the conversion of Paul, which was not brought about by any such instrumentality, but in an immediate and sudden manner by a violent crisis. Here could be no connexion with the spirit of Pharisaism, but only an utter opposition to it. We may suppose that the powerful spirit of Paul, disposed to exercise itself in eager controversy when left to the natural course of development, would be impelled, like the later ultra-Paulinians, to a direction altogether hostile to Judaism.

We have already remarked, that the influence of Hellenism on a man who in early youth had been trained in the schools of the Pharisees, cannot here be taken into account. In general, we must not proceed on the supposition that the freer mode of thinking was universal among the Hellenists. If, as appears from Philo's writings this was not the case even at Alexandria, where the Hellenic element of culture exerted the greatest influence and power, still less are we justified in supposing it to have been with the Hellenists generally, among whom we cannot admit the predominance of the element of Grecian culture in an equal degree. It might be expected, when a number of persons had devoted themselves so much to a foreign element of culture as to become estranged from the Jewish, that others would be so much more mistrustful of all cultivation of the Hellenic element, and their opposition to the abuse of freedom would drive them to greater illiberality of spirit, servitude to the letter, and narrowness of views. As we find among the Alexandrian Jews three parties, we might expect a similar variety among the Hellenistic Jews. The family of Paul, from which sprang the Pharisaic pupil, was probably attached rather to the more contracted, than to the liberal class. Ananias, the teacher of Paul, when he professed himself a Christian at Damascus, was universally respected on account of his legal piety, and such a man would be very far from leading Paul in the direction which the apostle's mind afterwards took. We might rather refer it to the influence of the liberal-minded Christians, who had proceeded from the midst of the Hellenists in consequence of the impulse given by Stephen, and of the influence of the new ideas called forth by that martyr; but we do not know, whether Paul soon after his conversion came into a social circle where influences of this kind would act upon him, and at all events we have no proof of it. Setting aside the Divine element, if we consider only the great originality of Paul's mind, we may not attribute too much to determining influences from without. But in addition to this, there was the extraordinary nature of his conversion in which the Divine element so powerfully predominated, by which, in virtue of that immediate communication with Christ, he was placed on a level with the other apostles. Hence also that Christian originality which marked the apostles in consequence of their personal connexion with Christ, must be also ascribed to him, if to any one. And that it was so, he testifies, declaring that he received the Gospel not from men, nor was instructed in it by men, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ; that as

soon as God had revealed his Son in him that he might publish him among the Gentiles, he at once sought not human counsel, nor visited the apostles at Jerusalem, but betook himself to a spot the furthest from all such instruction, where he must derive all his knowledge from an entirely different source. See Ep. Galat. c. 1.

In order rightly to understand the whole force and meaning of Paul's expressions relative to that internal transaction of which he alone could testify, we must first of all understand what he means by the term "revelation," ἀποκάλυψις. Everything good and true must be finally traced back to the Father of lights, from whom all lights beam forth for the spiritual world; his revelation in all must be acknowledged; and especially in all that is original and immediate in the consciousness, where from the hidden depths of the spirit, by virtue of the root of our existence in God, the light of new creative ideas springs up in the soul. Thus, if Paul had not more distinctly defined the idea of revelation, we might say that from the stand-point of religious intuition, looking only at the Divine causality, and not regarding natural instrumentality, he had attributed to Divine revelation that which proceeded from within by the development of reason. But if Paul knew this idea of revelation in a general sense, and expressly distinguished from it another more limited idea, then we must reject the supposition that he only by a peculiarity of religious dialect called *that* revelation which from another point of view might be otherwise named. He had in fact a peculiar word to designate that general idea of revelation which applies to all consciousness of religious and moral truth, to which the mind is led by the contemplation of creation, or by entering into itself, by conscience and reason; the word "manifest," φανεροῦν, which he uses for this purpose in the well-known passages in the first chapters of the Epistles to the Romans. But when he speaks of what can be known neither from the contemplation of creation, nor from the existence of reason or conscience, but only by a communication of the Spirit of God, differing from all these, and newly imparted, he uses the word "reveal," ἀποκαλύπτειν. Paul, it is true, also uses the more general designation, the word φανεροῦν, for that which cannot be known by the natural medium; but no passage can be pointed out, in which the word ἀποκαλύπτειν is used in the more general sense.

Tholuck, indeed, in the last edition of his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, p. 72, has appealed to Phil. iii. 15, as a passage to which this understanding of the word will not apply; and, certainly, there is some truth at the basis of what he says. No doubt, Paul in those words was not thinking merely of such an advance of insight into Christian truth as proceeds from an immediate operation of the Holy Spirit; but instrumentality by a process of thought animated by the Holy Spirit is also included. There is, without doubt, in these words, not merely a reference to new knowledge, such as must be communicated at once by the light of the Holy Spirit; but still more a suggestion that Christians who are yet immature ought to learn more thoroughly, and, by further

meditation carried on in the divine illumination which they have already received, or more fully animated by the Divine Spirit, whose organs they have become, ought better to understand the contents of the Christian truth already communicated to them; as, for instance, the relation of the Gospel to the Law, and the consequences developed from faith in the justification obtained through Christ. But still the word *ἀποκαλύπτειν* here retains its fundamental meaning, inasmuch as the insight spoken of does not proceed from natural reason, but is obtained only by the new light of the Holy Spirit. Here, therefore, we may also apply the distinction between the words *φανεροῦν* and *ἀποκαλύπτειν*; only Paul does not distinguish here the immediate operation of the Divine Spirit upon the soul, which, in virtue of a divine light at once rising upon it, is led to the consciousness of such truths as could not be known by unassisted natural reason—and the further development of these truths by subsequent thinking, animated and directed by the Holy Spirit. Still the divine light, always to be distinguished from the natural reason, into which it enters as something new, remains the fountain whence all is drawn, whether the original and the immediate Divine communications, or the further development and elaboration of the original—the reason, either in its simple receptivity, or in its self-activity as an organ working according to the peculiar laws of its nature, remaining ever an organ for the higher factor, the revealing or animating Holy Spirit. Now, inasmuch as everything is to be traced back to this, which, without its aid, could not be effected by the unassisted reason, the use of *ἀποκαλύπτειν* in its meaning as opposed to *φανεροῦν* is suitable. And we can only distinguish in the application of this word, which always retains its own peculiar meaning, the wider and the more limited use of it—the latter when the subject spoken of is the original, creative operation of the Divine Spirit, by which the knowledge of things hitherto hidden is imparted; the *ἀποκάλυψις* in such a sense as is essential to the gift of prophecy.

It is therefore plain, that when Paul attributes all his knowledge of Christian truth to *ἀποκάλυψις*, he traces everything back to an internal Divine causality. But here the question arises, whether, in reference to all which Paul knew of the life, the ministry, the discourses, and commands of Christ, all other sources of knowledge were excluded, and only this one of revelation left. In this case a supernatural communication would have occupied in him the place of all other communications through natural human instrumentality.

But it contradicts all analogy in the mode of the Spirit's operations in laying the foundation of the Christian Church, and in the propagation of Christianity, that what was matter of historical tradition should be conveyed into the consciousness by a supernatural revelation, independent of this historical connection. The office of the Spirit, of whom Christ says that he shall take of his own, and bring to remembrance what he himself had spoken on earth, was not just to *create* a tradition of Christ's words independent of this remembrance. It is wholly

unnatural to suppose that Christ communicated to Paul, in special visions, what he had spoken and commanded on earth. And it is by no means in contradiction to Paul's asserted independence in his apostolic vocation, that he obtained the historical materials of Christ's life and doctrine from the natural source, common to all, of tradition. It was in this connection enough, and the only important point, that in the understanding of the truth announced by Christ, and knowledge of its nature, he was dependent on no human instruction, but drew everything from the inward revelation of Christ, from the light of the Holy Spirit. This Spirit, who took of the things of Christ, and brought to remembrance what he had said, performed the same office for him as for the other apostles. On all occasions when Paul quotes the words or commands of Christ, he speaks in a manner that leads us to think of no other source of knowledge than that of tradition. Thus where he mentions the institution of the Supper,* he would have expressed himself quite differently, if the details of that institution had been made known to him by an immediate revelation from the Lord. He would no doubt have stated, with quite different emphasis, the manner in which he had been informed of it.

As Paul felt himself compelled to examine, independently of others, the depths of the truth made known by Christ, he must have been specially solicitous to obtain a collection of the sayings of Christ, on which all further developments of the new doctrine must depend, and from which they must proceed. We cannot suppose that he would satisfy himself with single expressions casually obtained from oral intercourse with the apostles, whom he met so seldom, and for so short a time. Besides, he says expressly, in his Epistle to the Galatians, that these interviews with the other apostles were of no service towards his acquiring a deeper insight into Christian doctrine. We are led to the supposition, that he obtained written memoirs of the life of Christ, or at least a written collection of the sayings of Christ, if such existed, or that he compiled one himself. But it is very probable that such a collection, or several such collections, and written memoirs of Christ's ministry, were in existence; for, however highly we may estimate the power of the living word in this youthful period of the Church, we cannot allow ourselves to forget that we are not speaking of an age of legends, but of one, especially wherever Grecian cultivation had found its way, of great

* 1 Cor. xi. 23. On this passage, Schulz justly remarks, that Paul uses *ἀπὸ* not *παρὰ* to signify that what he "received" was not *immediately* but *mediately* from the Lord. What has been said by Olshausen and Meyer (on different grounds) against this interpretation, has not induced me to give it up. Nor does it render the expression "*received from the Lord*" (*παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου*) by any means useless. It was not the apostle's design to mark the manner in which this tradition came to him, but only to represent as certain that this was the form in which the Lord had instituted the Last Supper; hence, also, the repetition of the term *κύριος* is not improper. Had Paul been speaking of a special revelation, by which this information was imparted, he would scarcely have signified it by "received," *παρέλαβον*, but rather by "was revealed," *ἀπεκαλύφθη*.

literary activity. Might we not expect, then, that some memorials would be speedily committed to writing of what moved their hearts, and occupied their thoughts so intensely; although a longer time might elapse before any one resolved to attempt a delineation of the whole life of Christ? * Many allusions to expressions of Christ in the Pauline Epistles, besides his direct quotations of Christ's words, point to such a collection of his discourses, of which the apostle availed himself. † Where Paul, in his Epistles, speaks of the imitation of Christ, he speaks as if a distinct historical image of the Saviour was well known throughout the Church; and taking everything together, we are justified in supposing that he

* Eusebius, as is known, narrates (V. 10), probably in consequence of information derived from Pantænus, that the apostle Bartholomew had communicated to the so-called Indians to whom he published the gospel, a Hebrew original document of the Evangelical History drawn up by Matthew, which account we are plainly not justified to call in question. This original document may indeed be the same which Papias (Eusebius iii. 39) entitles "an arranged collection of the discourses of the Lord," *σύνταξις τῶν λόγιων τοῦ κυρίου*. And I should by no means object to understanding this to be a collection of the discourses of the Lord—for it is in itself very probable that such a compilation would be early made, as source and material for the development of Christian doctrine—if what he had before said of Mark's writings did not intimate that he meant both the discourses and actions of Christ; for I cannot, with Schneckenburger, find the distinction, that Mark had compiled a report of the discourses *and actions* of Christ, but Matthew only of his *discourses*. In this case, Papias would have laid the emphasis on "discourses," *λόγια*, and have said *τῶν λόγιων τοῦ κυρίου σύνταξιν*; but the emphasis rests on the word *σύνταξις*, an orderly collection, not mere insulated fragments, yet, I must add, in limitation of what I have here said, and of what Dr. Lucke has said before me in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1833, p. 501, that while the emphasis certainly rests upon the word *σύνταξις*, as contrasted with a fragmentary description, yet it might also be that Papias wished to contrast the work of Mark as a fragmentary collection of the discourses and *actions* of Christ, with the work of Matthew as an arranged collection *of the sayings of the Lord alone*.^a Lastly, he says this only in a secondary sense of Mark. The words peculiarly apply to Peter, from whose discourses Mark must have borrowed the materials and the form of his work. Of Peter, he says, *ὃς πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λόγιων*, "who had composed his addresses according to the wants of his hearers at the time, and not with the intention of giving an orderly account of the discourses or sayings of Christ." Therefore, Mark, who drew all his information from these addresses, could compile nothing of that kind. The words of Papias are therefore rather favorable than unfavorable to the supposition, that the original work of Matthew was only a collection of the *sayings* of Christ, as Schleiermacher maintained. As Bartholomew took such a document with him for his mission, and so in like manner other preachers of the gospel may have done, it may be now that Paul himself obtained this same document or another. The Judaizing tendency of the document derived from Matthew, alleged by many, by no means prevents me from admitting this; it contains expressions which, by Ebionites cleaving to the letter might be interpreted according to their mind; but in which Paul, who penetrated deeper into the spirit, would find an entirely different idea.—See Life of Christ. Index a. v. Paul.

† Life of Christ. See Index v. Paul. Perhaps Marcion who held only Paul as inspired authority, had heard of a compilation of the Memoirs of Christ, which had been used by his favorite apostle, and he wished, by his criticism, to gather it out again from Luke's Gospel, which did not altogether conform to what he considered as Pauline.

made use of an original historical record respecting Christ's ministry in his addresses as a point of connexion for his instructions, which shorter record fell into oblivion when the canonical Gospels had attained to general notoriety and repute.

We may therefore suppose, that Paul, making use of such historical materials, learned to understand and develop from them the substance of Christ's discourses and the import of the transactions of his life, as also the substance of the truth revealed by Him; this he did by such special communications of the Divine Spirit, as we have distinguished by the name of "revelations," (*ἀποκαλύψεις*), and by his own mental activity animated by the same Spirit from whom these original movements proceeded; by this activity he developed still further, according to the deductions they offered, and in relation to the controversies of his times, the truths which had been introduced into his consciousness by those *ἀποκαλύψεις*. The manner in which he accomplished this was determined by the manner in which he himself had been converted, and by his dialectic cast of mind as developed in the Pharisaic school. Thus we can make it very evident to ourselves, how so many deep truths expressed by him, (as, for example, on the relation of the Law to the Gospel,) unfolded themselves to him from a prescient hint* given by Christ himself. †

If, therefore, we have good reason to believe that the peculiarities of Paul's views respecting the relation between the Law and the Gospel were early developed in his mind, we can at once account for his being led in his disputes with the Hellenists to exhibit this side of evangelical truth more freely, and thus to excite still more the anger of the Jews.

On the other hand, the prospect opened to him of a wider sphere of action among heathen nations. As he was one day in the temple, and by prayer lifting up his soul to the Lord, he was borne aloft from earthly things. In a vision he received an assurance from the Lord, that though he would be able to effect nothing at Jerusalem, on account of the animosity of the Jews, he was destined to carry the doctrine of salvation to other nations, even in remote regions; Acts xxii. 21. Accordingly, after staying in Jerusalem not more than fourteen days, he was obliged to leave it, through the machinations of the Jews. He now returned to his native place, Tarsus, where he spent several years, certainly not in inactivity; for by his labors the gospel was spread among both Jews and Gentiles in Tarsus and throughout Cilicia; there is good reason for believing, that to him the Gentile churches, which in a short time we find in Cilicia, owed their origin.‡

* Of course, I do not mean that which Christ himself only possessed, as the fulness of prescience; but that which presented itself to him who received it with a susceptible disposition, as the germ of a new spiritual creation.

† Life of Christ. Index, see Paul.

‡ The silence of the Acts respecting the labors of Paul in Cilicia, cannot be brought as evidence against the fact, for the account it gives of this period has many *lacunæ*. From

CHAPTER II.

THE CHURCH AT ANTIOCH THE GENTILE MOTHER-CHURCH, AND ITS RELATION TO THE JEWISH MOTHER-CHURCH.

IN the mean time, as we have already remarked, Christianity was propagated among the Gentiles by Hellenist teachers* in Antioch, the metropolis of Eastern Roman Asia. The news of this event excited great interest among the Christians at Jerusalem. It is true, the information was received more favorably than it would have been, if the account of the operation of Christianity among the Gentiles in the conversion of Cornelius had not materially contributed to allay their prejudices. But still a measure of mistrust was prevalent against the Gentile believers who were non-observant of the Mosaic law, a feeling which, after many repeated exhibitions of the divine power of the gospel among Gentile Christians, lingered for a long time in the majority of Jewish believers. On this account, Barnabas,† a teacher who stood high in the general confidence, and who as a Hellenist was better fitted to deal with Christians of the same class, was commissioned to visit the new Gentile converts. On his arrival he rejoiced at witnessing the genuine effects of the gospel, and used his utmost endeavors to advance the work. The extensive prospect which opened here for the advancement of the kingdom of God, occasioned his inviting Paul, who had been active among the Gentiles in Cilicia, to become his fellow-laborer. One evidence of the power

the manner in which Paul is mentioned as secondary to Barnabas, till the time of their first missionary journey, an argument might be drawn for his not having previously entered on any independent sphere of labor. But the case may be, that though Paul, as the younger and less known, was at first spoken of as subordinate to Barnabas, the elder and approved publisher of the gospel; yet, by degrees, Paul's extraordinary activity gave a different aspect to their relative position. In Jerusalem they continued for a longer time to assign the priority to Barnabas, as appears from the apostolic Epistle in Acts xv. 25, a circumstance which Bleek very justly adduces as a mark of the unaltered originality of this document; v. *Studien und Kritiken*, 1836, part iv. p. 1037. At all events, one would rather assign a date some years later to the conversion of Paul, (on which, too, we can never come to a decisive conclusion,) than suppose that he could spend several years in his native place without exerting himself for the propagation of Christianity,—he who, as he solemnly declares, had, from the time of his conversion, felt so strongly the impulse of an inward call to preach the gospel.

* See p. 65.

† When Baur, in the work already quoted, p. 40, casts a doubt on this mission of Barnabas from Jerusalem, and thinks that after the dispersion of the Hellenists occasioned by the persecution raised against Stephen, he had sought to form an independent sphere of action out of Jerusalem, we have only a specimen of those arbitrary conclusions and combinations raised to the dignity of facts by Dr. Baur, of which we have pointed out the worthlessness.

with which Christianity in an independent manner spread itself among the Gentiles, was the new name of Christians which was here given to believers. Among themselves they were called, the Disciples of the Lord, the Disciples of Jesus, the Brethren, the Believers. By the Jews names were imposed upon them which implied undervaluation or contempt, such as the Galileans, the Nazarenes, the Paupers; and Jews would of course not give them a name meaning the adherents of the Messiah. The Gentiles had hitherto, on account of their observance of the ceremonial law, not known how to distinguish them from Jews. But now, when Christianity was spread among the Gentiles apart from the observance of the ceremonial law, its professors appeared as an entirely new religious sect (a *genus tertium*, as they were afterwards termed, being neither Jews nor Gentiles); and as the term Christ was held to be a proper name, the adherents of the new religious teacher were distinguished by a word formed from it, as the adherents of any school of philosophy were wont to be named after its founder.*

Antioch from this time occupied a most important position in the development of Christianity. There were now two central points for the spread of it; what Jerusalem had hitherto been for this purpose among the Jews, that Antioch now became among the Gentiles. Here, first, the two modes of apprehending Christianity, distinguished from one another by the predominance of the Jewish or Gentile element, came into contact and conflict. As at Alexandria, at a later period, the development of Christianity had to experience the effect of various mixtures of the ancient oriental modes of thinking with the mental cultivation of the Grecian schools, so in this Roman metropolis of Eastern Asia, it met with various mixtures of the oriental forms of religious belief. From Antioch, at the beginning of the second century, proceeded the system of an oriental anti-Jewish Gnosis, which opposed Christianity to Judaism.

As there was considerable intercourse between the two churches at Jerusalem and Antioch, Christian teachers frequently came from the former to the latter; among these was a prophet named Agabus, who prophesied of an approaching famine, which would be felt severely by a great number of poor Christians in Jerusalem, and he called upon the believers of Antioch to assist their poorer brethren. This famine actually occurred in Palestine about A. D. 44.†

* When we take into account the great influence of the Latin language, as the language of the government in this chief city of Roman Asia, we shall certainly find no ground in the Latin form of the name to doubt, with Baur (p. 90), the truth of this account of its origin, and to find in it an anachronism.

† We cannot fix the exact time when this famine began. It is mentioned by Josephus in his *Antiq.* Book xx. ch. 2, § 5. It was so great that numbers died in it from want. Queen Helena of Adiabene in Syria, a convert to Judaism, sent vessels laden with corn, which she had purchased at Alexandria, and with figs procured in the island of Cyprus, to Jerusalem, and caused these provisions to be distributed among the poor. Luke, indeed, speaks of a famine that spread itself over the whole "habitable world," (*οἰκουμένη*) which was not the case with this. To understand by *οἰκουμένη* in this passage, Palestine

The faculty of foretelling future events, did not necessarily enter into the New Testament idea of a prophet, assuming now that Luke wrote from his own point of view. An address fitted to produce a powerful effect on an audience, one by which Christians would be excited to deeds of beneficence, would correspond to the marks of a prophetic address in the New Testament sense; but as in the Acts it is expressly added that the famine foretold by the prophet actually came to pass, we must doubtless admit, in this instance, that there was a prediction of an impending famine, although it is possible that the prophecy was founded on the observation of natural prognostics.

The Christians at Antioch felt themselves bound to assist, in its temporal distress, that church from which they had received the highest spiritual benefits, and probably sent their contributions before the beginning of the famine, by the hands of Paul and Barnabas, to the presiding elders of the church at Jerusalem. This church, having enjoyed about eight years' peace after the persecution that ensued on Stephen's martyrdom, was once more assailed by a violent but transient tempest. King Herod Agrippa, to whom the Emperor Claudius had granted the government of Judea, affected great zeal for the strict observance of the ancient ritual,* although on many occasions he acted contrary to it, on purpose to ingratiate himself with the Gentiles, just as by his zeal for Judaism he tried to attach the Jewish people to himself. Actuated by such motives, he thought it expedient to manifest hostility to the teachers of the new doctrine, of whom he had received unfavorable reports.

It is possible, that at that time the displeasure of the king or of the fanatical multitude was excited anew by special circumstances. It is worthy of note that James, the son of Zebedee and brother of John, was the first object of their persecution. It may have been at first only a hostility directed against him personally, and occasioned, perhaps, by something which he had said or done. We must bear in mind, that he who was at the same time one of the sons of thunder, and like his brother, one of those disciples who stood nearest to Christ, must have had peculiarities, some kindred to, and some quite different from, those of his brother. We have to regard him, as well as John, as one who had apprehended with peculiar depth the doctrines of Christ. We can easily discern how such a one could give special offence to narrow-minded zealots, although there are no historical traces which exactly determine the fact. Since now the king, who would make himself popular by his zeal for the old religious law, perceived that the execution of James won the approbation† of the people, he determined to consign Peter to a similar fate.

only, is not justified by the New Testament phraseology; but it is possible that the famine extended to other parts, and we must then suppose the word to be used somewhat rhetorically, and not with literal exactness, especially if we consider it as spoken by a prophet come from Jerusalem.

* Josephus, *Antiq.* Book *xix.* ch. 6 and 7.

† The arguments brought forward by Baur, p. 188, do not make out a falsehood in the

But on account of the feast—the Passover in the year 44*—he at first only cast him into prison. But by the special providence of God, Peter was delivered from prison, and the death of the king, which shortly followed, once more gave peace to the church.

If Paul and Barnabas arrived at Jerusalem during this disturbed state of things (assuming that Paul accompanied Barnabas) their stay was necessarily shortened by it, and they could accomplish nothing of consequence.† But if we compare the account in the Acts with the narrative of the Apostle Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians, and if we assume that the journey to Jerusalem, which he there mentions as the second, was really the second, according to the order in the Acts, then, this journey would acquire great importance.‡ We must then assume, that although

statement, that the king sought to gain the favor of the people by this proceeding against the Christians. Although, on the whole, the Christians were tolerated among the Jews as a Jewish sect, yet this does not exclude the fact, that the rage of the fanatical multitude might have broken forth against them on special occasion, and that one, who pretended to persecute the new sect out of zeal for the old religious law, may have used the occurrence to win favor to himself. If at a later time, the execution of James the Just was condemned by those whom Josephus calls the better class of the Jews; yet it by no means follows that at this time the proceedings against the Christians were judged of in just the same way. People in their treatment of tolerated sects are not always consistent. Very much depends on special circumstances and the mood of the moment. We yield here to the Acts the greater confidence that it in no way mistakes the difficult relation between the Jews and the Christians. We believe ourselves compelled to say this in the spirit of careful, and, in matters of doubt, even of scrupulous, inquiry, although we could, on reasonable grounds, admit an error here in the historical representation, without discrediting the essential truth of the transaction.

* For it was the last year of Herod Agrippa's reign, who held for at least three whole years the sovereignty of Judea, (Joseph. xix. 8, 2;) and, therefore, certainly reigned from the end of January, 41, to the beginning of the reign of Claudius, the end of January, 44; so that only the Passover of this last year could be intended, that which took place after Herod had reigned three whole years.

† As the words "about that time," κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν καιρὸν, in Acts xii. 1, cannot serve for fixing the exact date, the coincidence of this journey of Paul's with these events at Jerusalem, and the whole chronology founded upon it of the apostle's history, is not absolutely certain. Yet there is, at least, no valid argument against this arrangement.

‡ Irenæus adv. Hæres. lib. iii. c. 13, seems to consider it as settled that this, mentioned as second in the Epistle to the Galatians, was Paul's third journey. But what Tertullian says (contra Marcion, l. 20), goes on the supposition that it was his second journey. He alleges the same reason for thinking so, as Keil, in his essay on the subject lately published in his *Opuscula*; that Paul, in the first glow of his conversion, was more violent against Judaism, but later his feelings towards it were mollified. Thus he explains the dispute with Peter at Antioch. "Paulus adhuc in gratia rudis, ferventer, ut adhuc neophytus, adversus Judaismum." ("Paul as yet immature in grace," — "fervently, as yet a neophyte, against Judaism.") (It is contradictory to this supposition that he allows Paul to have given way to the Judaizers at Jerusalem, in reference to the circumcision of Titus, cont. Marcion, V. 3). And certainly it would better correspond with the character of Paul and the mode of his conversion, that, at first, he should engage in fiercer opposition to the observance of the law, than that his mind should gradually be developed in that freer direction. Yet this supposition, that it was his second journey, as we shall afterwards show, is by no means supported by historical evidence. What is advanced

the conveyance of the collection to Jerusalem was the avowed object and motive of this journey, yet Paul himself had another and more important end in view, which probably induced him to be the bearer of the contributions. It could be said, that as the strictly Pharisaical Jews held it absolutely necessary for the Gentiles to submit to the whole ceremonial law, and particularly to circumcision,* in order to enjoy the blessings of theocracy; as the mistrust of the Jewish Christians had already, as we have before remarked, manifested itself against the Gentile converts; and as the consequences of this state of feeling might have already appeared in the church at Antioch, which stood in so close a connexion with the parent church at Jerusalem; it is not at all improbable, that Paul and Barnabas felt it to be their imperative duty, in order to guard against a dangerous disagreement, to come to an understanding with the apostles at Jerusalem on this subject, and to unite with them in establishing fixed principles respecting it. It is, rather, in itself more probable, that such a mutual explanation took place earlier, than that it occurred at a later period.† It is true, such a conference of Paul and Barnabas with the three most eminent of the apostles, could not well be held at that time, since one of them was cast into prison; but too great an uncertainty is attached to the dates of these events, to render this

by Wurm, in his essay already quoted, in the *Tübingen Zeitschrift für Theologie*, against my application of the first passage from Tertullian, is not just. I have myself here remarked on the contradiction between the two passages, and in a writer of Tertullian's cast of mind—highly as we esteem the depth, fire, and vigor of his genius—such a contradiction is not very surprising.—But from Tertull. c. Marcion, lib. V. 2, 3, it is by no means clear, that he considered the second journey mentioned in the Epistle to the Galatians, as the same with that which was followed by the resolutions of the apostolic assembly at Jerusalem. Tertullian only says, that the Acts of the Apostles—whose credibility was not acknowledged by Marcion—represented the principles on which Paul acted not differently from what Paul states them to be in an Epistle admitted as genuine by Marcion; consequently, the account of Luke, in this respect, must be credible. So then, Tertullian, i. 9, by *rudis fides* means the same as in the passage first quoted. The *rudis fides* in that passage, is a faith still young and not fully tried, which hence could not possess so independent an authority; "*hoc enim*" "for this" (the temporary concession in reference to the circumcision of Titus) *rudis fidei et adhuc de legis observatione suspensæ* "to an immature faith, as yet in suspense concerning the observance of the law," (in reference to which it was still disputed whether they were not bound to the observance of the law) *competebat*, "was suited," namely, until Paul had succeeded in having his independent call to the apostleship and its peculiar grounds acknowledged by the other apostles.

* A Jewish merchant, named Ananias, who had converted King Izates of Adiabene, the son of Queen Helena, to Judaism, assured him that he might worship Jehovah without being circumcised, and even sought to dissuade him from it, that it might not cause an insurrection of his people. But when another stricter Jew, Elcazar, came thither, he declared to the king that since he acknowledged the divine authority of the Mosaic law, he would sin by neglecting any of its commands, and therefore no consideration ought to prevent his compliance. Joseph. Archæol. lib. xx. c. 2, § 4. And such was the opinion of the converts to Christianity from among the Jews, who, to use the words of Josephus, were *ἀκριβεῖς περὶ τὰ πάτρια*, "strict concerning ancestral institutions."

† As Dr. Paulus remarks in his *Exegetical Manual*, 1, i. p. 238.

objection of much weight. And it harmonizes well also with this view, that this conference is represented as a *private** *transaction* of Paul's with the most eminent of the apostles; partly because the matter appears not yet to have been sufficiently ripe for a public discussion; partly because by the persecution set on foot by King Agrippa, the intended public conference could have been prevented. By this supposition, we should gain therefore a connecting link in the history of the transactions between the Jewish and Gentile converts, and the two historical documents, the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistle to the Galatians, would each supply what is necessary for the completion of the other. But, in the first place, the chronology of the common reading, supported by the authority of all the manuscripts,† is irreconcilable with this hypothesis, for we must then reckon Paul's conversion to have taken place at least fourteen years earlier, which would be a computation wholly untenable. And, secondly, the relation in which Paul, according to the description in the Acts, stood, up to a certain time, to Barnabas, the elder preacher of the gospel, will not agree with this view. For at an earlier period, according to the slight notices furnished us by the Acts, Paul appears in a subordinate relation, both of age and discipleship, to the elder preacher of the gospel. It was not till he undertook the missionary journey with Barnabas from Antioch, in which he was the most prominent agent, that that apostolic superiority developed itself, which was

* The "but privately," *κατ' ιδίαν δὲ*, Gal. ii. 2, which contains an antithesis to "in public," *δημοσίᾳ*. Yet public conferences are by no means excluded; for it is not clear that the words *κατ' ιδίαν δὲ* follow what was before said, merely as a limiting explanatory clause. Paul, certainly, might, from the *whole* conference in which he *communicated to them* (*ἀντιθέμεν αὐτοῖς*;) (which may refer to the brethren generally) an expression which includes *all* that he transacted at Jerusalem—have singled out some circumstance to him of special importance, viz., his private interviews with James, Peter, and John, or he might at first, have noticed *only* the public, and afterwards the important private conferences, altogether passing over the former. Compare Wurm, p. 51; Anger, p. 149.

† The *Chronicon Paschale Alexandrinum*, ed. Niebuhr, p. 436, cites an opinion according to which Paul must have taken this second journey *four* years after his conversion; and this computation certainly assumes the reading to be "four years," *τεσσάρων ἐτῶν*, instead of "fourteen" *δεκατεσσ*. This reading being assumed, it may be readily understood how the preceding word (*δια*) could have occasioned the change of Δ into ΙΔ. And according to this reading, if we refer this to the second journey of Paul mentioned in the Acts, other dates will readily agree; only, if we reckon these four years from the conversion of St. Paul, that event must be placed about the year 40. But still it remains uncertain, whether the computation cited in the *Chronicon Paschale* is founded on a critical conjecture, or on the authority of a manuscript; and, at all events, the opposing evidence of all manuscripts and quotations from the Fathers is too important.—(Conybeare and Howson in their excellent work, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 233, n. 5, say:—"Neander, by mistake, asserts that the *Chronicon Paschale* reads *τεσσάρων*; but the reverse is the fact."—Neander only says that the passage referred to by him contains an opinion which *assumes* that reading, and he immediately notices the uncertain basis of the assumption. This opinion is found not in that part of the passage in the Chron. Pas. quoted by Conybeare and Howson, but in the sentence containing the words *ἐτη τέσσαρα* which they think relate to a different subject.—ED.)

afterwards exhibited in the transactions at Jerusalem. Still we cannot consider this remark as decisive of the question; for we may feel confident that such a man as Paul, especially if we grant his independent labors in Cilicia, must have come forward, even before the period of his apostolic superiority, with extraordinary efficiency when the occasion demanded it.

At all events, if we admit that Paul took such a journey, we must consider it as one not mentioned by him in the Epistle to the Galatians, and as the second of the journeys which he made to Jerusalem after his conversion. But it may be asked, whether this journey of Paul's is on the whole sufficiently accredited? Its not being mentioned in the passage quoted from the Epistle to the Galatians excites strong doubts. It may, indeed, be thought possible that in numbering his journeys to Jerusalem up to a certain time, this journey was passed over as not very important, or that at the instant of writing he did not happen to think of it. Still we cannot consider this as at all probable. Paul certainly so expresses himself that we cannot attach any other meaning to his words than, that after that short stay of fourteen days in Jerusalem, he had not been there till that journey which constituted an epoch in the history of the Church; hence he could say that he had continued personally unknown to the Churches in Judea—that they had only heard by report of the labors of him who had once been a persecutor. And what conclusion must we draw from this, relative to the account in the Acts? Nothing more than that the tradition which Luke followed, and which united Paul and Barnabas in their labors at this period, joined them here together, although for some reason this was an exceptional instance, or Paul might have been chosen as a delegate, but some unknown circumstance might have prevented his taking the journey. At least, we can more easily admit an oversight here, than resolve to do violence to Paul's own declaration.*

Since there was no deficiency of teachers in the church at Antioch, the Christians there would naturally reflect, after the conversion of the Gentiles had once begun, that the publication of the gospel should be extended from Syria to other heathen nations. Barnabas and Paul had probably at an early period expressed their desire to be employed in a wider sphere for the conversion of the Gentiles, as Paul had been assured by the Lord of his appointment to carry the gospel to distant nations. And as Barnabas had brought his nephew Mark with him from Jerusalem to Antioch, it is not unlikely that he was prompted to this step by the prospect of a more extensive field in which he might employ his relative as a fellow-laborer. The teachers who were assembled at Antioch appointed a day of fasting and prayer, to lay this matter before

* I agree here, as in most points, with Bleek; see his *Beiträge zur Evangelien-Kritik*, Berlin, 1846, p. 55; a work that contains the result of an unprejudiced, profound, and cautious criticism; from this writer, indeed, nothing else could be expected.

the Lord, and to pray for his illumination to direct them what to do. A firm persuasion was imparted to them all by the Spirit of God, that they ought to set apart and send forth Barnabas and Paul to the work to which they were called by the Lord.

CHAPTER III.

THE PROPAGATION OF CHRISTIANITY FROM ANTIOCH BY PAUL AND BARNABAS.

ACCOMPANIED by Mark, they first visited the island of Cyprus, the native country of Barnabas, whose previous connection with it facilitated the introduction of the gospel. They traversed the island from east to west, from Salamis to Paphos. In their teaching they followed the track which history had marked out for them, that method by which the gospel must spread itself among the heathen. As the Jews, in virtue of their connexion with the theocratic development, and of the promises intrusted to them, had the first claim to the announcement of the Messiah;* as they were in a state of the greatest preparation, and places

* *πρῶτον Ἰουδαίῳ*, "to the Jew first" Rom. i. 16, compared with John iv. 22. The credibility of what is narrated in the Acts on this and other occasions respecting the manner in which Paul turned to the Gentiles immediately after the ill reception which he met with from the Jews assembled in the synagogue, would be shaken if Dr. Baur were correct in his assertion, (see his Essay on the Object and Occasion of the Epistle to the Romans, in the *Tübingen Zeitschrift für Theologie*, 1836, No. iii., p. 101,) that the author of the Acts did not give a faithful relation of objective facts, but modified them according to his peculiar views and aim; that they are to be explained from the apologetic design with which he maintains the position, that the gospel reached the Gentiles only through the criminality and unbelief of the Jews. This is connected with Baur's idea of an anti-Pauline party, consisting of persons who took offence at the Pauline universalism, (his preaching the gospel both to Jews and Gentiles,) and which had its seat in Rome. For this party such an apologetic representation of Paul's ministry must be supposed. We might be allowed to cast such a suspicion on the representation in the Acts, if any thing artificial was to be found in it, any thing not corresponding to what might be expected from the circumstances of the times. But if the line of conduct ascribed to the apostle, and its consequences, appear altogether natural under the circumstances, it does not appear how we can be justified in deducing the repetition (of Paul's mode of acting,) not from the nature of the thing, in which it was really grounded, but from the subjective manner of the narrator. Now, in all the cities where synagogues existed, they formed the most convenient places for making known the gospel, when Paul was not disposed to appear in the public market-places as a preacher. Here he found the proselytes assembled, who formed a channel of communication with the Gentiles, and in the passage quoted from the Epistle to the Romans, the principle is stated according to which the Jews had the first claim to the publication of the gospel. Love to his own people produced the earnest desire to effect as much as possible for their salvation along with his calling as an

already existed among them for the purposes of religious instruction; it was on these accounts natural that the apostles should first enter the synagogues, and the proselytes of the gate, whom they had met with, afforded them the most convenient point of transition from the Jews to the Gentiles. In Paphos, they found in the proconsul, Sergius Paulus, a man dissatisfied with all that philosophy and the popular religion could offer for his religious wants, and anxious to receive every thing which presented itself as a new communication from heaven; hence, he was eager to hear what Paul and Barnabas announced as a new divine doctrine. But, also, from that very sense of religious need, unsatisfied, and guided by no clear self-knowledge, he had given ear to the deceptive arts of an itinerant Jewish Goës, Barjesus.* These Goëtæ were in succeed-

apostle of the Gentiles, Rom. xi. 14. That I have brought forward this from the Epistle to the Romans, which Baur has made use of as a proof of the existence of such an apologetic interest, is not on my part a more *petitio principii*, for I cannot in any way reconcile it with the character of the apostle, that he could express such principles and such desires at that time, merely for certain special purposes. But it was natural that he should turn away from the great mass of the carnally-minded Jews, if he found only here and there individuals among them of susceptible dispositions, and devote himself to the Gentiles alone. It does not follow from this that his call to the apostleship among the heathen was determined merely by accidental circumstances; for if he found a greater number of Jews in a city disposed to believe, yet his other calling would not thereby have been frustrated; but among the converted Hellenistic Jews, who were more closely related by birth or education to those who were Greeks, he would have found assistance for establishing the Christian church among the Gentiles; and when, after so many painful experiences, he had little hopes of success among the Jews, still he could not give up the attempt to do something for his countrymen, if by any means he might save some; especially since he could so well unite this with the interests of his calling, and could find no more convenient and unostentatious method of paving his way to the Gentiles. And does not the peculiar mixture in the churches of the Gentile Christians, the influence of Judaizers upon them, give evidence of their origination? Rom. xi. 12 will also establish this point. And that the author of the Acts has given a narrative consistent with facts and the actual state of things, is shown by this, that when describing the course of Paul at Athens, he does not repeat the same method of proceeding, but represents him as acting in a different manner, adapted to the local peculiarities.

* On this account, it was not at all uncommon for such sorcerers to find access to men of the highest rank. Thus Lucian narrates, that the most distinguished men in Rome most eagerly inquired after the prophecies of a sorcerer, Alexander of Abonoteichos, in Pontus, who acquired great notoriety in the reign of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius; among the zealous adherents of Alexander, he mentions especially an eminent Roman statesman, Rutilianus, of whom he says—*ἀνὴρ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθὸς καὶ ἐν πολλαῖς πράξεσι ῥωμαϊκαῖς ἐξητασμένος, τὰ δὲ περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς πάννυ νοσῶν*; Alexand. § 30; (a man in other things, indeed, good and noble, and esteemed in many Roman offices, but in matters pertaining to the gods altogether diseased). Lucian. Baur. (p. 94) objects to the use I here make of this work of Lucian's, because it is evident, he says, that in this discourse he was not describing an historical person, but only intended to paint the manners of the times. Certainly, we do not appeal to Lucian's work as a sure source of historical information, but can only suppose a groundwork of especial historical truth, which Lucian fills up for the object he had in view. But this decides nothing against my use of it. If Lucian gives the manners of his times, the traits must be bor-

ing times the most virulent opposers of Christianity, because it threatened to deprive them of their domination over the minds of men;* and for the same reason, this man took the utmost pains to hinder the spread of the gospel, and to prejudice the proconsul against it. But Paul, full of holy indignation, declared with divine confidence, that the Lord would punish him with the loss of that eye-sight which he only abused by attempting with his arts of deception to stop the progress of divine truth. The threatening was immediately fulfilled; and by this sensible evidence of the operation of a higher power, the proconsul was withdrawn from the influence of the Goēs, and rendered more susceptible of divine instruction.

Thence they directed their course further northward; passed over to Pamphylia, and along the borders of Phrygia, Isauria, and Pisidia, and made a longer stay at the considerable city of Antioch,† (which, as a border-city, was at different periods reckoned as belonging to different provinces,) in order to allow time for making known the gospel. Paul's discourse‡ in the synagogue is a specimen of the peculiar wisdom and skill of the great apostle in the management of men's feelings, and of his peculiar antithetical mode of developing Christian truth. He sought first to win the attention and confidence of his hearers, by reminding them how God had chosen their fathers to be his people, and then gave an outline of God's dealings with them, to the times of David, the individual from whose posterity, according to the promises, the

rowed from the life, and hence we can make use of his work as a proof that the narrative under our consideration contains nothing inconsistent with the character of the times to which it belongs.

* Of which the Alexander mentioned in the preceding note is an example.

† To distinguish it from the Asiatic metropolis, it is called *Ἀντιόχεια πρὸς Πισιδίαν*.

‡ Baur maintains that this discourse bears the marks of arbitrary composition; that the greater part is cast in the same mould as the discourses of Peter, already reported in the Acts, and only at the close, a Pauline turn of expression is brought in, a foreign element, not at all suited to the whole. We very readily grant that we have no exact and complete report of Paul's discourse, and that we should have recognized more of what is peculiarly Pauline, if the discourse had come down to us in its original form. Yet we cannot assent to what Baur says about the composition; but we think that there may be discerned the genuine main features of the discourse delivered by Paul. We find here a combination of the peculiarly Pauline as it appears in the doctrine of Justification, with what, according to the nature of the case, formed the common type in all apologetical discourses of the apostles when addressing Jews. The references to the ancient history of the Theocratic people and to the Messianic element must, of course, always be prominent. The adducing of Christ's resurrection as a proof of the divine agency belongs also to the common foundation of the Christian testimony, and is brought forward not less in the Epistles of Paul. As Paul was speaking to persons who for the first time were invited to the Faith, he would naturally express himself otherwise than in his epistles addressed to believing Christians. In such a discourse the resurrection of Christ was necessarily introduced as a practical, divine credential for the Messiahship of Jesus; a credential also for what he had effected by his sufferings for the salvation of mankind. If this kind of composition is to be set down as un-Pauline, then Romans iv. 25, must be also un-Pauline. See Schleiermacher's *Einleitung in das neue Testament*, p. 375.

Messiah was to spring. After the introduction he came to the main object of his address, to the appearance of the Messiah, and to what he had effected for the salvation of mankind. Then turning to the Jews and proselytes present, he proceeded to say, that for them this announcement of salvation was designed, since those to whom it was first proposed, the Jews at Jerusalem, and their rulers, had been unwilling to receive it; they had not acknowledged the Messiah, nor understood the prophecies, which they heard read every Sabbath-day in their synagogues.* Yet, while in their blindness they condemned the Messiah to death, they could not retard the fulfillment of the prophecies, but, against their design and will, contributed to it; for after he had suffered all things which according to the predictions of the prophets he was to suffer, he rose from the dead. By faith in him they could obtain forgiveness of sins and justification, which they could never have obtained by the law.† And after announcing this promise to them, Paul closed with a threatening warning to unbelievers. This discourse, uttered with all the impressiveness of firm faith, and yet evincing so much tenderness towards the Jews, made at first a favorable impression upon them, and, in the name of the whole assembly, they requested him to expound his doctrine more fully on the next Sabbath.‡ Such was the impression

* Only using milder expressions, Paul here says the same things of the blindness of the Jews, which he often says in stronger and more severe language in his Epistles, accusing them of obduracy.

† To justify my views of this passage, I must make a few remarks as to the right interpretation of Acts xiii. 39. I cannot understand it as if the apostle meant to say—Through Christ men obtain forgiveness of *all* sins, even of *those* of which forgiveness could not be obtained through the law. The apostle certainly knew only one forgiveness of sins and one justification; and he used the term “all things”, *πάντων*, only to mark the completeness of the removal of guilt, as the idea of “righteousness”, *δικαιοσύνη*, pre-supposes this; but the preceding *πάντων* occasioned him to refer the relative pronoun by a kind of logical attraction to this term of universality, rather than to the whole idea of being justified, *δικαιωθῆναι*, which he had especially in view. What Meyer says in his commentary in defence of the common interpretation, does not convince me. “Paul,” he remarks, “specifies one part of the universal ‘forgiveness of sins,’ *ὑπερὶ ἁμαρτιῶν*, as particularly worthy of notice, but this does not at all injure the unity of the forgiveness of sins and justification.” I do not perceive how Paul, from his point of view, could render one special part more prominent than another; I know indeed of *no* sin from which a man could be justified by the law; in Paul’s mind, there could be here no difference whatever. The peculiarly Pauline style of carrying out the contrast between faith and the law here appears in the germ.

‡ If, in Acts xiii. 42, we take *μεταξὺ*, (between, intervening,) in its usual acceptation, we must understand the passage thus: Paul and Barnabas were requested to explain the Christian doctrine to them during the week between this and the next Sabbath, therefore before the next celebration of the Sabbath. Such a request might be very suitable, if it were that of individuals who wished to hear discourses on the doctrine in their private circles during the week. But it does not appear so proper as a wish expressed by the whole congregation at the synagogue. We should then also most naturally refer it to the Gentiles, and on that account should be obliged to consider the reading “the Gentiles,” *τὰ ἔθνη*, in the 42d verse as correct, though it seems to be a

made by his words on the assembly in general. But there were many among the Jews present, and especially the proselytes, who were more deeply affected than the rest, and who longed after the redemption announced by Paul. They could not wait till the next Sabbath, but hastened after Paul, who had left the synagogue with Barnabas; they informed them of the impressions they had received, and earnestly requested more ample instruction. Paul and Barnabas consequently availed themselves of many opportunities to explain the divine doctrine in private houses during the course of the week, and likewise to make it known among the Gentiles. Hence, by the next Sabbath, the new doctrine of salvation had obtained notoriety through the whole city, and a multitude of the Gentile inhabitants flocked to the synagogue in order to hear Paul's discourse. This was a spectacle sufficient to stir up the wrath of the Jews, who were filled with spiritual pride and with a delusive notion of their superiority as members of the ancient Theocracy, and hence this discourse of Paul's was not heard with the same favorable disposition and calmness as the first. He was interrupted by violent contradictions and reproaches. He then declared to them, that since they were not disposed to receive the salvation announced to them, and excluded themselves from it to their own condemnation, the preachers of the gospel had discharged their obligations, and would now turn to the Gentiles, who had shown themselves disposed to receive their instructions, and that the gospel was designed to be a fountain of light and salvation to nations in the uttermost parts of the earth. Thus Paul and Barnabas left the synagogue with the believing Gentiles, and a suitable chamber in the dwelling of one of their number, probably, was the first place of assembling for the church that was now formed. Christianity spread itself through the whole circumjacent district; but the Jews contrived,

glossa. Also the word "Sabbath," *σάββατον*, in the Acts is never used in the sense of a week; for the phrase "first day of the week," *μία σαββάτων*, cannot be brought as a voucher for this meaning. But if we understand *τὸ μετὰ τὸ σάββατον*, of the next Sabbath, all will be clear; and a comparison with verse 44 favors this interpretation, which is also sanctioned by the ancient glosses and scholia in Griesbach and Matthæi. From the earlier Greek writers it is certainly difficult to find an authority for this meaning of *μετὰ*, but not from the later. In Plutarch's *Instituta Laconica*, c. 42, *μετὰ* occurs twice in this sense, and especially in the second passage, "the Macedonian kings *after* Philip and Alexander," *τοῖς μετὰ Μακεδονικοῖς βασιλεῦσιν*, for it cannot be otherwise understood; and so likewise in Josephus, *De Bello Jud.*, lib. v. c. 4, § 2, where, after speaking of David and Solomon, he says, *τῶν μετὰ τούτων βασιλέων*, which can only mean, "the kings *after* these."—I consider the words "The Jews out of the synagogue," *ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων*, and the words, "the Gentiles," *τὰ ἔθνη*, as glosses, founded on a misunderstanding; but I cannot, with Kuinoel, take the whole of the verse, so strongly accredited as genuine, to be only a gloss. What is said in this verse, may be considered as marking the vivid representation of an event by an eye-witness. As Paul and Barnabas were going away before the whole of the congregation had separated, they were requested by the elders of the synagogue to repeat their addresses on the next Sabbath. But after the whole congregation had separated, many individuals ran after them to open their hearts to them more unreservedly.

by means of the female proselytes belonging to the most respectable families in the city,* and their influence on their husbands, to raise a persecution against Paul and Barnabas, so that they were obliged to leave the place. They proceeded to the city of Iconium, about ten miles to the east, in Lycaonia,† where they had access to both Jews and Gentiles. But by the influence of the hostilely disposed among the former, who also here had gained over to their side a part of the people and the magistrates, they were driven from this city also. They now betook themselves to other cities in the same province, and first tarried in the neighboring town of Lystra. As in this place there was no synagogue, and scarcely any Jews dwelt in it, they could make known the gospel only by entering into conversation‡ in places of public resort, and thus leading persons to religious subjects; gradually small groups were formed, which were increased by many who were attracted by curiosity or interest in the subject of conversation. Paul was one day thus instructing in divine truth a company who had gathered round him, when a man who had been lame from his birth, and probably was used to sit for alms in a thoroughfare of the city, listened to him with great attention. The divine in the appearance and discourse of Paul deeply impressed him, and caused him to look up with confidence as if he expected a cure from him. When Paul noticed this, he said to him with a loud voice, "Stand upright on thy feet;" and he stood up and walked.§

* Here, as at Damascus, (and other instances might be mentioned,) Judaism found most ready acceptance with females, as Christianity did afterwards.

† In other times it was considered as belonging to Phrygia, or Pisidia.

‡ A frequent practice of modern missionaries in Asia.

§ Only *he* will feel compelled to believe this statement who acknowledges the new divine powers of life, which through Christ have been introduced into the human race. But whoever is not entangled in a mechanical view of nature, whoever acknowledges the power of Spirit over nature, and a hidden dynamic connexion between soul and body—to such a person it cannot appear wholly incredible that the immediate impression of a divine power operating on the whole internal being of man, should produce results of altogether a different kind from remedies taken out of the stores of the ordinary powers of nature. What Baur says (p. 95) in his note on these words, induces me to add a few words to justify my remarks. He finds fault with the first words as giving "a very unworthy view of Christianity—since it must follow that miracles belong so essentially to Christianity that wherever it is not accompanied by such acts, it does not manifest its divine life-power. And since, confessedly, no such wonders take place now, Christianity must have been long devoid of vitality." But this can have been written only in consequence of a palpable distortion of my language, even if not intentional; for such a distortion might easily take place without design, by interpreting what I have said, from a foreign point of view. Of divine powers in Christianity persons speak in one sense from the stand-point of supernaturalism, and in another, from that of rationalism, whether it be a deistical or a pantheistical rationalism—a rationalism which with reckless consistency goes so far as to deny everything supersensual and beyond the present life, or which inconsistently leaves something supersensual and of a future life remaining. If by the divine powers of Christianity we understand something specific and peculiar, not proceeding from the regular development of human nature, something new, in a true sense supernatural, which is introduced through the supernatural event of the appearance of Christ and his whole work—then from such a

This sight attracted a still greater crowd, and the credulous people now esteemed the two apostles to be more than men,—gods who had come down in human form to confer benefits on men. A belief of this kind, deeply seated in the human breast, and proceeding from the undeniable feeling of the connexion of the human race with God, was spread from ancient times among the heathen,* and at this period was much increased

point of view, what we call miracle will appear as the sign corresponding to this supernatural principle on its introduction into the natural development of mankind; an operation related to this causality. And it can with perfect justice be said, that whoever entertains this view, whoever acknowledges the Scriptural Christ in his true supernaturalness, has no reason in the nature of the case itself for not acknowledging a miracle connected with the first development of Christianity. And therewith is it by no means affirmed that this supernatural divine power having once entered into the life of humanity, must always be accompanied by such miracles. Rather, we consider it as belonging to the law of the development of this divine power in the human race, that after it has once adapted itself to the natural development of humanity, these outward marks of the supernatural will cease. But what Christianity has effected and continues to effect for the spiritual and moral transformation of the world we recognise as proceeding from the same divine power which inheres in Christianity and is identical with that miraculous element. But the case is altogether different, when by "the divine power of Christianity" nothing more is understood than an excitement of the powers already lying in human nature through an impulse given by Christ, in no other sense than that in which we speak of the excitement of higher powers in humanity by the movement called forth by any eminent man through his influence on society, or than that in which we speak of a divine power in all the manifestations of Truth and Goodness.

But as to the second part of this note, it stands in no contradiction to the idea of a miracle as represented by me. It would only affect such an idea of a miracle as Dr. Baur has erroneously attributed to me and to the advocates of the supernaturalistic point of view, an idea which from his stand-point of Naturalism or Pantheism logically carried out, he regards as the only consistent one; but against which I have often sufficiently guarded myself both in this work and in the Life of Jesus. It is by no means asserted in these words, as Baur's interpretation of them would imply, that the miracle could be denied only from the stand-point of a mechanical view of nature, which certainly would be an unfounded and unjust assertion. There is only a *certain denial* of miracles, (which is not to be said of every denial,) as there is also a *certain mode of asserting* miracles, which proceeds from a mechanical view of nature. Nor were these words at all designed to commend this special miracle to those whose views are merely not mechanical, to show the possibility of it from such a point of view, but only to indicate that from the stand-point of a deeper, more living conception of nature, one has no cause to set himself beforehand against many immediate operations which are analogous to what we term miracles; that from this point of view it is not so easily permitted to pass sentence on uncommon occurrences, as if they were absolute impossibilities. I have written this by way of explanation for the advocates of another stand-point, as far as freedom from prejudice, the love of truth, and rectitude can receive such an explanation. Whoever knows how to estimate scientific character, even with opposite convictions, will not be disposed, with Dr. Baur, to describe me as one who only uses the weapons of a vulgar controversialist.

* Homer says: "Gods likening themselves to strangers from foreign lands, being in all forms, haunt cities," θεοὶ ξείνοισιν εἰκότες ἀλλοδαποῖσι, Παντοῖοι τελέθοντες, ἐπιωτρῶσι πολλῆας. Od. p. 485. Although I am very far from confounding this (the Apostolic) age with the Homeric, I can by no means acknowledge the correctness of Dr. Baur's assertion, that at this time, among the uninstructed people, there might have been a

by the existing religious ferment.* Now in this city Zeus was worshipped as the founder of cities, as the originator, guide, and protector of civilization,† as the founder and protector of this city in particular (*Zeὺς πολιεύς, πολιοῦχος*), and a temple at the entrance of the city was dedicated to him.‡ Accordingly the people imagined that their tutelary deity, Zeus himself, had come down to them; and as Paul was foremost in speaking, and possessed—as we may conclude from his Epistles, and his speech at Athens—a peculiarly powerful address, and a high degree of popular eloquence, he was taken for Hermes, while Barnabas his senior, who perhaps had something imposing in his appearance, was believed to be Zeus. The people made their remarks to one another on these strangers in the old Lycaonian dialect, so that Paul and Barnabas were not aware of their drift, and were therefore quite unprepared for the result. The news of the appearance of these supposed divinities quickly reached the temple, and a priest came with oxen, which were generally sacrificed to Zeus, and with garlands to adorn them, to the gates of the city;§ it may be he wished to sacrifice to Zeus before the gate for the welfare of the city; or intended to bring the animals to Paul's residence, and there to perform the sacrifice; but before he had entered the gates, Paul and Barnabas hastened thither, full of consternation, having discovered the object of these preparations. They rent their garments—a customary sign among the Jews of abhorrence for whatever outraged the religious feelings—and rushed among the crowd. Paul exclaimed, "What do ye! We are men like yourselves; we are come hither for

belief in demoniacal and goëtic operations, but not in new appearances of the gods, and that therefore this account of the Lycaonians must be unhistorical.

* When Baur says against these words, that the religious ferment rather excited doubt and unbelief, we must reply, that in times of such ferment, heterogeneous elements are wont to come together, fanaticism, superstition, and unbelief, which Baur himself, as is evident from his own expressions, must acknowledge; but then no ground is left for disputing what I said.

† As Aristides in his discourse *εἰς Δία* says, that as Zeus is the Creator and Giver of all good things, he is to be worshipped under manifold titles according to these various relations. "All names whatsoever he found great and fit for himself." *Πάνθ' ὅσα αὐτὸς εἶρε μέγала καὶ αὐτῷ πρέποντα ὀνόματα.*

‡ Libanius *ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱερῶν*, ed. Reiske, vol. ii. p. 158, remarks that cities were built in the immediate vicinity of temples, hence frequently the buildings nearest the walls were ancient temples; as in the middle ages, the site of towns was often determined by that of the churches and religious houses; and as in our own times, in the South Sea Islands, settlements are formed near the residence of the missionaries, which gradually become villages and towns.

§ The word "gates," *πυλῶνες*, Acts xiv. 13, as no other term is added, may be most naturally understood of the city gates, not of the door of the house in which Paul and Barnabas were staying; in the latter case, the plural would hardly have been used. The "ran out," *ἐξεπήδησαν*, in verse 14 can prove nothing; for it might easily be omitted to state whether they heard of what had happened while in their lodging, and now hastened to the gates, or were at that time near the gates. Perhaps Luke himself had no exact information on these points.

this very purpose, that you may turn from these who are no gods, to the living God, the Almighty Creator of the universe, who hitherto has allowed the nations of the earth to try by their own experience to what they can attain in the knowledge of religion by the powers of their own reason, but who yet has not left himself without witnesses among them, by granting them all good things from heaven, and supplying them with those gifts of nature which contribute to the preservation of life and to their general well-being.”*

Even by such an appeal it was difficult to turn the people from their purpose. Yet this impression on the senses, so powerful for a short time, soon passed away from men who were not affected internally by the power of truth. The Jews from Iconium succeeded in instigating the greater part of the people against Paul. And this transition from one extreme to the other, from a reverence which beheld beings of a higher order in the apostles, to fury against them as enemies of the gods, cannot, certainly, in such a popular gathering, driven by sudden excitement from one impression to its opposite, be regarded as surprising. He was stoned in a popular tumult, and dragged out of the city for dead. But while the believers from the city were standing round him and using means for his restoration, he arose, strengthened by the power of God; and after spending only the remainder of that day at Lystra, he departed with Barnabas to the neighboring town of Derbe. When they had proclaimed the gospel there and in the neighborhood,† they again visited those towns in which they had propagated the faith on this journey, and which through persecutions they had been obliged to leave sooner than they wished; they endeavored to establish the faith of the new converts, and regularly organized the churches. They then returned by their former route to Antioch.

CHAPTER IV.

CONTROVERSY BETWEEN THE JEWISH AND GENTILE CHRISTIANS AND ITS SETTLEMENT.—THE INDEPENDENT DEVELOPMENT OF THE GENTILE CHURCH.

WHILE in this manner Christianity spread itself from Antioch, from the parent-church of the Gentile world, and that great revolution began,

* The sense of benefits received should have been the means of leading men to the Giver. From a perversion of this sense arose systems of natural religion, to which the immediate revelation of God, appealing to that original but misunderstood and misdirected sense, was directly opposed.

† The “round about,” *περίχωρος*, v. 6, evidently means only the places lying in the

which has continued ever since to work its way among the nations, a division threatened to break out between the two parent-churches, those two central points from which the kingdom of God began to extend itself. It was a great crisis in the history of the church and of mankind. Hidden antagonistic principles at first necessarily came forth to be overcome and reconciled with one another by the power of Christianity. The question was, whether Christianity, not only then, but through all future ages, could thus control them.

There came to Antioch many strictly pharisaical-minded Christians from Jerusalem, who, like the Eleazar we have already mentioned, assured the Gentiles that they could not obtain any share in the kingdom of God and its blessedness without circumcision, and entered into a controversy with Paul and Barnabas on the views they held on this subject. The church at Antioch resolved to send a deputation to Jerusalem for the settlement of this dispute, and their choice naturally fell on Paul and Barnabas, as the persons who had been most active in the propagation of the gospel among the Gentiles. Paul had, besides, a special reason which would have determined him to undertake the journey without any public commission. It appeared now high time for him to explain himself to the apostles respecting the manner in which he published the gospel among the heathen, that he might bring into distinct recognition their unity of spirit amidst their diversity of method (made necessary by the diversity of their spheres of action) and to obviate all those antagonisms by which the consciousness of that essential unity could be disturbed. He felt assured by divine illumination, that an explanation on this subject was essential for the well-being of the church. The proposal to send such a deputation to Jerusalem might very likely have originated with himself. He went up to Jerusalem in the year 50,* to render an account (as he himself tells us in the Epistle to the Galatians), partly in private interview with the most eminent of the apostles,† partly in public before the assembled church, of his conduct in publishing the gospel, that no one might suppose that all his labor had been in vain, but might learn that he preached the same gospel as themselves, and that it had been effective with divine power among the Gentiles. He took

immediate vicinity of these two towns, certainly not a whole province, and least of all, from its geographical position, the province of Galatia. Hence the supposition that Paul in his first missionary journey preached the gospel to the Galatians may be safely rejected.

* On the supposition that Paul, in his Epistle to the Galatians, reckons the fourteen years from his conversion, and that this took place in the year 36. Thus about six years would have passed since his return from Jerusalem to Antioch.

† We have already remarked, that though Paul, in his Epistle to the Galatians, particularly mentions his private conferences with the most eminent apostles, yet in doing so, he by no means excludes other public discussions. Indeed, it is self-evident, that Paul, before this subject was discussed in so large an assembly, had agreed with the apostles on the principles that were to be adopted. Nor would he in an assembly composed of such a variety of characters, bring forward everything which might have passed in more private communications. See p. 109.

with him a converted youth of Gentile descent, Titus, (who afterwards became his chief associate in preaching,) in order to exhibit in his person a living example of the power of the gospel among the heathen.

It was a principal object with Paul to explain to the apostles the manner in which he had been accustomed to publish the gospel among the Gentiles, and to obtain from them an acknowledgment of his apostolic ministry as not a vain one. This must certainly have been to him a point of the first importance. If the apostles and James, the brother of the Lord, (who stood next to them, and had the greatest influence in the Jewish Church,) should agree in opinion with him, their influence would have a great effect, and there would be no danger of a division in the church. If, on the other hand, they placed themselves in opposition to him, all conferences with any other parties would be useless. But with this object in view, Paul may also have acted as a delegate from one church to the other.

If, setting out from the account in the Acts, we find that public conferences were held, yet we must presume that these were not the first, but that Paul first of all explained himself in private to the apostles, before whom he could express himself without reserve on every topic, prior to his bringing forward the subject in an assembly consisting of such heterogeneous materials. We must necessarily presuppose that he assured himself of perfect agreement with the apostles before he would venture to risk the issue of such a public council. But if we set out with that private conference between Paul and the apostles, we are certainly justified in concluding that this could not be considered as sufficient, but that it would be attempted to bring the church in which so much that was Jewish predominated, to an acknowledgment of the points agreed upon by Paul and the apostles; and this could be done only by public conferences. Thus we must maintain that the account in the Acts and that in the Epistle to the Galatians do not contradict each other; indeed, so far from that being the case, if we had only one representation we should be led by the pragmatic historic connexion,* to fill it up with the substance of the other. Paul, therefore, first of all, applied himself to the apostles Peter and John, and to James the brother of the Lord. To them he explained in

* I cannot comprehend how Baur (p. 116) can find fault with such an adjustment, (which appears to me absolutely necessary,) as uncritical and arbitrary. That Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians says nothing of a public discussion, is not surprising; for he brings forward what for him was the most important point, in combating with his opponents, who wished to make the authority of the Palestinian apostles and of James absolute. But those public discussions and their result he could take for granted, as well known. They were not of so much consequence to him, as the acknowledgment of his independent call from heaven to publish the Gospel. The phrase "but privately to them which were of reputation," *κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσι*, is certainly nothing more than a designation for what had before been left indefinite, and it must be granted Dr. Baur, that nothing more can be drawn from it with certainty; but it is very possible that there was a reference in the apostle's mind to what had taken place "in public," *δημοσίᾳ*.

what manner he had been accustomed to publish the gospel among the heathen, and described to them the success of his ministry—what God had effected by him for the conversion of the Gentiles, how God himself had thus accredited his method as the right one. And the apostles, prepared by what had already taken place,* acknowledged that God, who had called Peter to publish the gospel among the Jews,† had also bestowed on Paul the power to labor for the gospel among the Gentiles. They agreed with him that he and they should each continue to labor in their respective spheres, only the new churches among the Gentiles should give a pledge of their common faith, and of their gratitude to the primitive Church at Jerusalem, from whom they had received the gospel, by contributing towards the temporal necessities of its poor. What now had been expressed on both sides? That the Gentiles should not be subject to the pressure of Judaism, but with them everything should depend on faith in the Redeemer; that on the other hand, the Jewish Christians should not be compelled to renounce at once the ecclesiastical constitution corresponding to their national, theocratic point of view and founded in their historical development. How easily might Paul's ardent spirit, in his zeal for the fundamental truths of the gospel, which to him were most important, have been hurried along to require from the believing Jews, that they should place themselves on a level with the Gentiles in the renunciation of everything Jewish. If they really acknowledged that nothing more was required for the justification of man than faith in the Redeemer, without the works of the law, it would appear a necessary consequence, that they should give a practical proof of their assent by throwing off the yoke of the law. Their adherence to the observance of the law appeared at variance with this belief; it was a practical confirmation of the opposite conviction. Paul might easily have taken this view of the subject. And on the other hand, how easily could the Palestinian apostles, who had been accustomed to connect the new spirit of the gospel with the old Jewish form of life, have been led to consider as inseparable what had been mingled in their own conceptions and practice, especially since Christ himself had in all things observed the law. What an impression might the sight of a heathen, living altogether in a Gentile manner, make on a James who probably had never left Jerusalem, and had lived from his youth up in

* We believe that it has been sufficiently indicated above, that the preceding developments, as recorded in the Acts, which were connected with the conversion of Cornelius, offer no contradiction to what now took place.

† Peter, as the person who from the first had been most active for the spread of the gospel, here makes the principal figure; James's vocation was confined to the internal guidance of the Church at Jerusalem. That Peter was preëminently the apostle of the circumcision is quite consistent with his having been once and again called to extend his ministry to the Gentiles; and equally so was it consistent with Paul's being the apostle of the uncircumcision, that he rejoiced in the opportunities he had of converting individuals among the Jews. Rom. xi. 14.

the strict observance of the law ! And was such an one to be acknowledged as a member of the same religious community, as an equally privileged brother in the faith ? In the conduct of the apostles on this occasion, we are struck with the combination of genuine liberality of mind and wisdom ; how each side retained their own point of view, indicated by history, and yet both renounced it, and raised themselves to the fellowship of a higher unity, founded on the essence of the gospel, by which all their limited individualism was abandoned. In the conviction that faith in Jesus as the Messiah was the only necessary and all-sufficient means of justification and sanctification, the Palestinian apostle must have agreed with Paul. Otherwise they would not have granted that this without the Mosaic law, was sufficient to make the Gentiles fellow-members of the kingdom of God. The same must also hold good in its application to the Jews, or it must be admitted that in their opinion the Jews who observed the Mosaic law would have some preëminence in the kingdom of the Messiah. But of such an opinion we find no trace. On both sides there was an acknowledgment of equal Messianic rights to believing Jews and Gentiles. There remains, therefore, only one of two things ; either they followed in their practice such principles as they had developed into clear consciousness, or they followed the pressure of history, guided by the Holy Spirit, without being clearly conscious of the principles which lay at the ground of their conduct.

In the first case they followed the principles which Paul expressed when he said, "that to the Jews he became a Jew," (1 Cor. ix. 20,) in order to gain the Jews to the gospel ; or, "Let every man, wherein he is called, therein abide with God." (1 Cor. vii. 24.) Two principles form the basis of these words ; first, that a man without giving up anything of his inward freedom must accommodate himself outwardly to the position of the Jews, in order to gain them the more easily to the faith ; and secondly, that no one should withdraw arbitrarily from the stand-point on which he has been placed by historical development. Whoever might embrace the Christian faith, being a member of the Jewish people, need make no external alteration, but might expect that through the power of the new Christian spirit everything would be transformed by an internal change, or, that by the great developments in the world's history, such as the destruction of Jerusalem—a judgment on the corrupt Theocracy—the dissolution of outward Judaism would be brought about.

But in the second case, it might be supposed that many who felt themselves compelled to acknowledge the operations of the Holy Spirit among the Gentiles, as agreeing with the principle of the justifying power of faith alone—still, without giving themselves a clear account of the reason, could not themselves resolve to give up the outward Judaism, from which the whole of their religious development had proceeded ; for in religion, to put away the outward, which has grown up intertwined with so many devotional feelings, is always a most difficult task ; and this was more especially the case in the relation of Christianity to Judaism, since

in Judaism there were so many things which might be spiritualised in Christianity. Thus a James might find it very difficult to resolve to renounce altogether the outward observances of Judaism. It was otherwise, as appears from what we have already said, with the apostle Peter. At all events, we can find in this proceeding of the elder apostles nothing of vacillation or inconsistency, nor ought we to require that, when they acknowledged that the gospel without the law, was designed for Gentiles as well as for Jews, they should, in accordance with this principle, feel compelled to take a part in preaching the gospel among the Gentiles. They, evidently, did not so feel. And consistently with this, they considered *that* alone as their call from God, indicated by historical development, to form a point of transition to the gospel for the *Jews*; just as Paul regarded it as *his* vocation, indicated by his peculiar religious development, to be the apostle of the Gentiles. There did not lie in these *principles* any ambiguity and inconsistency, which would, of themselves, have worked evil results, and brought on those later dissensions between the Jewish and Gentile Christians. It was the fault of *men* that the views of the guiding wisdom of the apostles could not be accomplished, since so few knew how to enter into these principles and the spirit which had suggested them. Well-intended plans of adjustment between conflicting principles seldom attain their end.

The most important points, accordingly, were first of all discussed between Paul, James, Peter, and John.* Then, in particular circles, in which Paul and Barnabas narrated what God had effected by their preaching among the Gentiles, their accounts were received with joyful interest. But some who had passed over to Christianity from the Pharisaic school, now came forward and declared that it was necessary that the Gentiles should receive circumcision along with the gospel, and that they could acknowledge them as Christian brethren only on this condition, and therefore insisted that Titus should be circumcised.† But Paul strenuously maintained against them the equal privileges of the Gentiles

* The order in which the three apostles in Gal. ii. 9 are mentioned, is not unimportant. The reading according to which James stands first, is without doubt the true one; the other must have been derived from the custom of giving Peter the primacy among the apostles. But the priority is given to James, because he was most esteemed by the Jewish Christians, who were strict observers of the Mosaic Law, and stood at the head of the church at Jerusalem, while Peter, by his intercourse with the Gentiles and Gentile Christians, was in some degree estranged from that party.

† As appears from Paul's own representation, he had no share in any part of this proceeding; for he distinguishes expressly (Gal. ii. 4-6) the false brethren from "those who seemed to be somewhat," *δοκοῦντες εἶναι τι*. By the name of false brethren, certainly those persons were designated who did not acknowledge the believing Gentiles as true brethren in the faith, and did not admit the principle on which the Christian community was founded, that faith in Jesus as the Messiah is the only and sufficient means of salvation for all. Paul was one with the apostles in opposition to these views. But it may be asked whether that dispute broke out before or after the explanation between Paul and the elder apostles. The former is far more probable; for as that explanation was for him the principal object of his journey to Jerusalem, he would attend to it before anything else.

in the kingdom of God, and that by faith in the Redeemer they had entered into the same relation towards God as the believing Jews: for this reason, he would not give way to them in reference to Titus, for this would have been interpreted by the Pharisaic Jewish Christians as a concession of the principle for which they contended.*

As these objections gave rise to much altercation, it was thought necessary that the subject should be discussed in a convention of the whole church; but this was afterwards changed into a meeting of chosen delegates.† At this meeting, after much discussion, Peter rose up, to appeal to the testimony of his own experience. They well knew, he said, that God had long before‡ chosen him, to bring the Gentiles to faith in the gospel; and since God who seeth the heart had communicated to them the Holy Spirit, in the same manner as to the believers from among the Jews, he had by this act testified that in his eyes they were no longer impure; that, after he had purified their hearts by faith in the Redeemer, they were just as pure as the believing Jews; and hence, in the communication of spiritual gifts, He had made no difference between them. How then could they venture to question the power and grace of God, as if he could not without the law admit the Gentiles to a participation of salvation in the kingdom of God? Why would they lay a yoke on believers, which neither they nor their fathers had been able to bear? By "a yoke" Peter certainly did not mean the outward observance of ceremonies simply as such, for he himself still observed them, and did not wish to persuade the Jewish Christians to renounce them. But he meant the outward observance of the law, so far as it proceeded from

* The reading which omits "to whom not," *οὐκ ὁδοῦ*, in Gal. ii. 5, would suppose, on the contrary, a concession of Paul in this case, but which, under the existing circumstances, would be wholly inconsistent with the character of the apostle. This peculiar reading of the old Latin church, evidently proceeded in part from the difficulty of the construction for the Latin translation, and partly from the perception of a supposed contradiction between the conduct of Paul with Titus, and his conduct with Timothy, and likewise from opposition to Marcion. That in the Greek church, which, in consequence of the principle of the *οἰκονομία* predominating in it, must have been disposed to such a reading, no trace of it can be found, proves how very much the authority of the manuscripts is against it.

† The whole church was far too numerous, to allow of all its members meeting for consultation; but that they took a part in the deliberations, appears inferrible from the words, "with the whole church," *σὺν ὅλῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ*, Acts xv. 22. The epistle to the Gentile Christians was written in the name not merely of the elders of the church, but of all the Christian brethren. Also the words, "all the multitude," *πάν τὸ πλῆθος*, Acts xv. 12, favor this interpretation.

‡ Peter's words, "a good while ago," *ἂν ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων*, are of some value for a chronological purpose, since they evidently show, that between the holding of this assembly and the conversion of Cornelius, to say the least, a tolerable length of time must have elapsed. Having shown, as I believe, that there is no ground for regarding the narrative of Cornelius as unhistorical, I, also, fail to see the ground for Dr. Baur's position that Peter could not have used the words *ἂν ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων*. They are used relatively, and only a trivial, fault-seeking, verbal criticism can find an anachronism in them.

an internal dominion over the conscience, making justification and salvation dependent upon it; from which arose the dread of putting their salvation in jeopardy by the slightest deviation from it, and that tormenting scrupulosity which invented a number of limitations, in order, by self-imposed restraint, to guard against every possible transgression of the law. As Peter understood the term in this sense, he could add, "But we also by faith in Jesus as our Redeemer have been freed from the yoke of the law, since we are no longer bound to it as a means of justification; for we, as well as the Gentiles, believe that we shall obtain salvation through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ."

These words of Peter made a deep impression on many and a general silence followed. After a while, Barnabas, who had for years been highly esteemed by this church, rose, and then Paul. In addition to the facts reported by Peter which testified the operation of the Divine Spirit among the Gentiles, they mentioned others from their own experience, and recounted the miracles by which God had aided their labors. When the minds of the assembly were thus prepared, James* came forward, who, on account of his strict observance of the law, was held in the greatest reverence by the Jews, and in whose words, therefore, the greatest confidence would be placed. He brought their deliberations to a close, by a proposal which corresponded to his own peculiar moderation and mildness, and was adapted to compose the existing differences. Referring to Peter's address, he said that this apostle had shown how God had already received the Gentiles, in order to form a people dedicated to his service. And this agreed with the predictions of the prophets, who had foretold that in the times when the decayed Theocracy was to be gloriously revived, the worship of Jehovah would be extended also among the Gentiles. Accordingly, what had recently occurred among the Gentiles need not excite their astonishment. God who effected all this, was now fulfilling his eternal counsel, as he had promised by his prophets. Since, therefore, by this eternal counsel of God, the Gentiles were to be incorporated into his kingdom by the Messiah, let them not dare to do anything which might obstruct or retard the progress of this work. They ought not to lay any unnecessary burdens on the converted Gentiles. They should enjoin nothing more upon them than abstinence from meat offered to idols† or, of animals strangled, from blood and from unchastity.‡ But as to believers from among the

* The question whether this was the son of Alphæus, or another person, must be left for future examination.

† What remained of the flesh of animals used in sacrifice, was partly used by those who presented the sacrifice at their own meals, (especially if they were festive in honor of the gods,) and partly disposed of in the market. The eating of what was called *זבחי מיתים* was regarded by the Jews with the greatest detestation. *Pirke Avoth* ch. iii. § 3.

‡ Most of these points belonged to the seven precepts, to the observance of which men were bound before the giving of the Mosaic law; which God gave the sons of Noah,

Jews, no such special injunctions were needed for them. They already knew what they were to practise as Jews; for in every city where Jews resided, the law of Moses was read on the Sabbath days in the synagogues, Acts xv. 21.* The concluding words were to reconcile the Jews to that freedom from the Mosaic law which was allowed to the Gentile Christians.

The resolutions passed on this occasion had for their object, to reduce by mutual approximation the opposition existing between the Jewish and Gentile Christians. The observance of these ordinances by the latter, would tend to lessen, and by degrees to destroy, the aversion with which native Jews were wont to regard as impure, men who had been brought up as idolaters; it might assist us in forming correct notions of their feelings to compare (though the cases are not exactly parallel) the

and to the observance of which the Proselytes of the Gate bound themselves. Vid. *Buxtorf, Lexicon Talmudicum et Rabbinicum*, sub voce *א*.

* It appears to me entirely impossible, to understand the words in Acts xv. 21 (as they have been understood by the latest expositors, Meyer and Olshausen), as containing a reason for what had been said just before. *This assembly required no reason why they should impose so much, but only why they should impose no more on the Gentile Christians.* Also from the form of the clauses in v. 19 and 20, if such a reference existed, we should expect to find a reason for the injunction "that we trouble not," *μὴ παρενοχλεῖν*. These words, too, taken in their obvious sense, cannot contain the positive reason for the issuing of these injunctions, for that Moses was read in the synagogue every Sabbath-day, should rather serve as a foundation of a requirement for the observance of the whole law. But in verse 21, the emphasis is on the word *Μωσῆς*, and in that is concealed an antithesis to that which is given as the stand-point for the converts from heathenism. But as to what concerns the Jews, those who *wish* to observe the law, we need to say nothing new to *them*, for they can hear every Sabbath in the synagogue what *Moses* requires of them. It cannot be our intention, while we prescribe *no more than this* to the converts from heathenism, to diminish the reverence of the Jews for the Mosaic law. Chrysostom adopts very nearly this interpretation, by following the natural connexion of the passage. Hom. 33, § 2: *Καὶ ἵνα μὴ τις ἀνθυπενέγκῃ, διατι μὴ Ἰουδαίοις τὰ αὐτὰ ἐπιστέλλομεν; ἐπήγαγε λέγων*, (and that no one may bring up the question why we enjoin not the same things on the Jews, he added); and he explains the words v. 21, *τοῦτ' ἐστι, Μωσῆς αὐτοῖς διαλέγεται συνεχῶς*, (that is, Moses constantly discourses with them.) It gives me pleasure to agree with Dr. Schneckenburger in my view of this passage; see his excellent remarks, in his work before quoted, on the Acts, p. 23.

In this new edition I must adhere to this explanation, and cannot agree with that recommended by Dr. Baur after Gieseler—namely, that these words contain a reason for the leading thought that the Gentiles, by faith in Jesus Christ as the Messiah, must be also incorporated in the kingdom of God; for if this could have been effected by the Mosaic law, it must long ago have been brought to pass, since the Mosaic law must have been sufficiently known to them, as it was read every Sabbath in the synagogues. I cannot find this sense indicated in the words. Had this been intended, I should have expected an addition to v. 21, "in every city in which Gentiles dwell," and yet this would have said too much. And the leading thought—"and yet this has not effected the conversion of the Gentiles"—must have been actually expressed. We should consider ourselves quite unauthorized, arbitrarily to supply so important a proposition. According to my view, only something unessential is supplied in a proposition which the speaker merely expresses incidentally, and then hastens away from.

relation of the offspring of a nation where Christianity has long been established to the newly converted Christians from modern heathenism. But if the believing Jews could not bring themselves to overcome their prejudices against the believing Gentiles as uncircumcised, it would be so much more difficult to bring such persons closer to them, if they did not at all observe what was required of the usual Proselytes, and renounce what from the Jewish point of view appeared closely connected with idolatry, and the impure life of idolaters. And as these ordinances would serve on the one hand to bring Gentile Christians nearer to Jewish Christians; so on the other hand, they might contribute to withdraw the former more from the usual heathenish mode of living, and guard them against the pollution of heathen society and heathenish vices. The experience of the next century teaches us, how even the misunderstanding, which made out of these ordinances a positive law applicable to all ages of the Church,* might in this direction work for good. Viewing the transaction in this light, it is indeed surprising that, to ordinances merely disciplinary, and intended for only one particular period, and for persons under certain peculiar relations, the command against unchastity binding in all ages, and relating to an objectively moral point, should be annexed. But the connexion in which this prohibition appears, furnishes the best explanation of the cause and design of its introduction. "Fornication," πορνεία, is mentioned in connexion with the other points, on account of the close connexion in which it appeared to the Jews to stand

* In the first ages, Christians were distinguished by not venturing to eat any of the things forbidden in this injunction. But when the early indiscriminating opposition against heathenism had ceased, a more correct view was taken, which Augustine has beautifully developed. "(Apostoli) eligisse mihi videntur pro tempore rem facilem et nequaquam observantibus onerosam, in qua cum Israëlitis etiam gentes propter angularem illum lapidem duos in se condentem aliquid communiter observarent. Transacto vero illo tempore, quo illi duo parietes, unus ex circumcisione, alter ex præputio venientes, quamvis in angulari lapide concordarent, tamen suis quibusdam proprietatibus distinctius eminebant, ac ubi ecclesia gentium talis effecta est, ut in ea nullus Israëlita carnalis appareat, quis jam hoc Christianus observat, ut turdas vel minutiores aviculas non adtingat, nisi quarum sanguis effusus est, aut leporem non edat, si manu a cervice percussus nullo cruento vulnere occisus est? Et qui forte pauci tangere ista formidant a cæteris iridentur, ita omnium animos in hac re tenuit sententia veritatis." Matt. xv. 11. *Augustin c. Faustum Manich.* lib. xxxii. c. 13. (The apostles seem to me to have chosen for the time a thing easy and in no way burdensome, which the Gentiles also together with the Israelites, in virtue of that corner-stone hiding them both in itself, might observe. But the time having passed in which the two walls, one of circumcision the other of uncircumcision, although uniting in the corner-stone, stood out boldly in their own peculiarities; and the church of the Gentiles having become such that no carnal Israelite may appear in it; what Christian now scruples to touch a thrush or smaller bird whose blood has not been spilled, or to eat a hare strangled by the hand and not killed by a cruel wound? And the few, who, by chance, fear to touch these things are laughed at by others. So has the truth in this matter taken hold of the minds of all.) The opposite view, it is true, was maintained in the Greek Church, in which the injunction of abstinence from blood and from animals strangled was confirmed by the Second Trullanian Council, in the year 692

with idolatry ; for in the writings of the Old Testament they were accustomed to see idolatry and unchastity everywhere placed together ; excesses of this class were actually connected with many parts of idolatry ; and in general the strict idea of chastity lay, on the whole, far from the views and practices of natural religion. It is introduced here not as a special moral precept of Christianity ; in that case, it would not have been so insulated as a positive command, but would rather have been deduced from its connexion with the whole of the Christian faith and life as we find it in the Apostolic Epistles. Here it is introduced as a part of the ancient Jewish opposition to every thing which appeared connected with idolatry, and this opposition was now to be transferred to the new Christian Church.

Although these injunctions had the precise object mentioned, and doubtless, ultimately attained it, yet we cannot conclude with certainty, that James had a clear perception of it in all its extent, when he proposed this middle way. As the persons who composed this assembly acted not merely according to the suggestions of human prudence, but chiefly as the organs of a higher spirit that animated them, of a higher wisdom that guided them, it would follow, that their injunctions served certain ends in the guidance of the church, which were not perfectly clear to their own apprehension. Even James himself does not develop the motives which determined him to propose such a measure. In this assembly there was no occasion, as we have before remarked, to mention the motives, but merely to develop the reason, why no more than this, and not the whole law, should be imposed on Christians ; and this reason accordingly, he deduced from what he and the other apostles recognised as the central point of the Christian faith. Possibly James, without any distinct views and aims, only believed that something must be done for the Gentile Christians, (who were to be acknowledged as members of God's kingdom, with equal privileges, in virtue of their faith in Jehovah and the Messiah,) to bring them nearer, as it regarded their outward mode of life also, like the Proselytes of the Gate,* to Judaism and the Jews.†

* I mean only analogous regulations ; for had there been simply a transference of such as were enjoined on Proselytes of the Gate, it would have been sufficient to require of the Gentile Christians, among whom many Proselytes of the Gate might be found, that they should submit to all the regulations which had hitherto been observed by persons of that class.

† Luther, who was far from the restricted, unnatural notion of inspiration, and the slavish adherence to the letter, maintained by the theologians of the 17th century, says, in reference to this proposal of James (vol. iii. p. 1042 of Walch's edition), "that the Holy Spirit allowed St. James to make a false step." But even if James had not before him that higher object, the guidance of the church, this ought not to be called a false step, in relation to the peculiar position which he took in the historical development of primitive Christianity ; for he was appointed by the Lord of the church to occupy the intermediate point which was to connect the Old Testament with the independent development of the New, and from which he was to infuse the new spirit of the gospel into the form of the Old Testament. It becomes us, when we are considering the joint labors of

But although it was not necessary in this public assembly, to develop in a positive manner the motives for framing these injunctions, we are certainly not to assume, that the apostles left the decision of the principles on which they meant to act towards Gentile Christians to the deliberations of this meeting; but as we have before remarked, they most probably brought forward only what seemed to them in their private conference best adapted for their object; in that consultation it was necessary to discuss the motives for these injunctions, and the objects which it was proposed to attain by them; for in relation to what Paul desired—that to those among the Gentiles who acknowledged Jesus as the Messiah, nothing further should be prescribed—a conciliatory proposal of this kind must have been accompanied by a statement of grounds for it. And as we must acknowledge in James the power of the Christian spirit, which subordinated to the interests of Christianity his attachment to Judaism and the forms of the ancient theocracy; so in Paul, who was so zealous for the independence of Christianity and of the Gentile churches, we must recognise a zeal tempered by Christian wisdom, which yielded to a measure of accommodation determined by circumstances.*

The resolutions adopted on this occasion were now communicated to the Gentile churches in Syria and Cilicia,† in an epistle drawn up in the name of the assembly; and two persons of good repute in the church, perhaps members of the Presbytery at Jerusalem, Barsabas and Silas (Sylvanus), were chosen as bearers of it, and were to accompany Paul and Barnabas, and counterwork the intrigues of their Judazing opponents. We will here insert this short epistle, probably dictated by James himself, and the earliest public document of the Christian church known to us.‡ It is as follows: “The Apostles and Elders, and Brethren,§

the apostles, to observe attentively the whole scheme of organic historical development, in which each member takes his appropriate station and all are designed to be complements to one another.

* Luther beautifully remarks, in the passage above quoted, “Therefore James prescribes and the others consent, it is enough for them that their consciences are still left free and unfettered; as for the decree, *that*, they think, will of necessity, gradually become void; they are not so contentious as to wish to quarrel about a little thing, provided it be in no way injurious.

† The injunctions were designed, it is true, for all Gentile Christians, but the epistle was addressed only to the churches specified in it, because in these the dispute had first of all arisen, and because they must have been respected, as parent churches among the Gentiles, with which the later formed Asiatic churches would connect themselves. Hence also Paul, in Gal. i. 21, as a general description of the sphere of his labors, mentions only “the regions of Syria and Cilicia,” κλίματα τῆς Συρίας καὶ τῆς Κιλικίας.

‡ The style of this document (marked by simplicity and extreme brevity) testifies its originality. Had the author of the Acts set himself to compose such an epistle, and attempted to assume the situation of the writer, it would have been a very different composition. And hence we may draw a conclusion relative to the discourses given in the Acts.

§ According to the reading adopted by Lachmann, it would be, “The Apostles and Presbyters, Christian brethren”; they wrote as brethren to brethren. This reading is

send greeting to the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia.* Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain which went out from us, have troubled you with words, saying ye must be circumcised, and keep the law, to whom we gave no such commandment: it seemed good unto us being assembled together,† to send chosen men unto you, with our beloved Barnabas and Paul,—men that have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. We have therefore sent Judas and Silas, who shall also tell you the same things by mouth.‡ For it seemed good to us, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit,§ to lay

strongly supported. We can hardly deduce its origin from hierarchical influences, which would exclude the church from such consultations and decisions: its antiquity is too great, for we find it in Irenæus, iii. 12, 14. It is also quite as much against the hierarchical spirit for the apostles and presbyters to write to the brethren as brethren. And it is easy to see how it might have happened that since, from the introductory words of Luke, an epistle from the whole church was expected, it seemed necessary to distinguish the brethren from the apostles and presbyters, and hence the words *καὶ οἱ* might have been inserted. Yet since, in Acts xv. 22, the whole church is mentioned in connexion with the apostles and presbyters, we might expect in the epistle itself a distinct reference to the church; the “from us,” *ἐξ ἡμῶν*, also, of verse 24 (for these anonymous complainers could hardly have belonged to the presbyters of the church) appears to assume this. The first *καὶ οἱ*, verse 23, must therefore at an early date have occasioned the omission of the second.

* The “greeting,” *χαίρειν*, here wants the *ἐν κυρίῳ*, “in the Lord,” which is so common in the Pauline epistles; and it deserves notice also that, as a form of salutation, *χαίρειν* is found only in the Epistle of James.

† The words *γένομενοις ὁμοθυμαδὸν*, I do not understand with Meyer, “being unanimous,” but, “when we were met together;” as *ὁμοθυμαδὸν* often denotes in the Acts, not, “of one mind,” but, “together,” as in ii. 46. We may see from the Alexandrian version, and Josephus (Antiq. xix. 9, § 1), how the change of meaning has occurred.

‡ The explanation of this passage, Acts xv. 27, is in every way difficult. If we refer “the same things,” *τὰ αὐτὰ*, to what goes before, the sense will be,—they will announce to you the same things that Barnabas and Paul have announced to you. So I understood the words in the first edition of this work. The words *διὰ λόγου*, “by mouth,” are not exactly against this interpretation; for though these words contained reference to what followed in writing, they might be thus connected, namely, as we now in writing also express the same principles. But since mention is not made before of the preaching of Barnabas and Paul, and we must therefore supply something not before indicated, and since the words *διὰ λόγου* contain a reference to what follows, and therefore not *καταγγέλλειν*, but *ἀπαγγέλλειν* is here used, I now prefer the other interpretation, although in this case likewise, it is difficult to supply what is necessary. In Irenæus we find a reading which presents the sense required by the connexion in a way that removes all difficulties, but must perhaps be considered as an exposition: *τὴν γνώμην ἡμῶν*, *our opinion*, instead of *τὰ αὐτὰ*, *the same things*,—annuntiantes nostram sententiam. Iren. ii. i 12, 14.

§ In the explanation also of Acts xv. 28, I depart, and with greater confidence, from my former view. Agreeably to the manner in which *δοκεῖν* is everywhere used with the dative of the person as the subject, I cannot help understanding it to be so used with the words *τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι*, especially since if it meant, by “the Holy Spirit,” we should, according to the New Testament idiom, expect *ἐν* to be prefixed. It is therefore stated first: it has so pleased the Holy Spirit—then: we as his organs have resolved. Although the affair was determined according to both, it was important to mention first, that this

upon you no greater burden than these necessary things—that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from unchastity; from which, if ye keep yourselves,* ye shall do well. Fare ye well.”

We may conclude from this epistle, that those who had raised the controversy in the Antiochian church, had appealed to the authority of the apostles and presbytery. Perhaps they represented themselves as delegates to the church at Jerusalem,—as this was afterwards made of importance by the adversaries of Paul—but they were not acknowledged as such. We see how important it was for the apostles to accredit Paul and Barnabas as faithful preachers of the gospel, and to give a public testimony to their agreement in spirit with them. Yet we cannot help remarking the brevity of the epistle—the want of a pouring forth of the heart towards the new Christians of an entirely different race—the absence of the development of the views on which the resolutions passed were founded. The epistle was without doubt dictated in haste, and must be taken only for an official document, as the credentials of an oral communication. But they depended more on the living word, than on written characters. Hence, while the written communication was so brief, they sent living organs to Antioch, who would explain every thing more fully according to the sense of this meeting.

Thus Paul and Barnabas, having happily attained their object at Jerusalem, returned to the Gentile Christians at Antioch with these pledges of Christian fellowship, and accompanied by the two delegates. Barnabas took also his nephew Mark with him from Jerusalem, to be an assistant in the common work. He had formerly accompanied them on their first missionary travels in Asia, but had not remained faithful to his vocation; giving way to his feelings of attachment for his native country, he had left them when they entered Pamphylia. At Jerusalem, Barnabas met with him again, and perhaps by his remonstrances, brought him to a sense of his former misconduct, so that he once more joined them.

This decision of the Apostolic Assembly at Jerusalem, forms an important era in the history of the apostolic church. The first controversy which appeared in the history of Christianity was thus publicly expressed and brought into clear recognition; but it was at the same time manifested, that, by this controversy, the unity of the church was not to be destroyed. Although so great and striking a difference of an outward kind existed in the development of the church among the Jews and of that among the Gentiles, still the essential unity of the church, as

resolution was not formed according to human caprice, but that the Holy Spirit so willed it. I translate in the text, not verbally, but according to the sense.

* The expression in Acts xv. 29, “from which if ye keep yourselves,” *ἐξ ὧν διατηροῦντες ἑαυτοὺς* is remarkably similar to that in James i. 27, “to keep himself unspotted from the world,” *ἁσπιλον ἑαυτὸν τηρεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου*.

grounded on real communion of internal faith and life, continued undisturbed, and thus it was manifest that the unity was independent of such outward differences: it became henceforth a settled point, that though one party observed and the other party neglected certain outward usages, yet both, in virtue of their common faith in Jesus as the Redeemer, had received the Holy Spirit as the certain mark of their participating in the kingdom of God. Nor were these differences merely outward dissimilarities; but, as we might conclude from the peculiar nature of the modes of thinking among the Jews,* which mingled itself with their conceptions of Christianity, it involved several doctrinal differences. The latter, however, were not brought under discussion; those points only were touched which were most palpable, and appeared the most important from the Jewish stand-point of legal observances. While they firmly held one ground of faith,—faith in Jesus as the Messiah, and a consciousness of fellowship in the one spirit proceeding from him,—they either lost sight altogether of these differences, or viewed them in relation to their common faith, the foundation of the all-comprehending kingdom of God, as very subordinate. But at a later period these differences would, if not overpowered by the energy of a Christian spirit progressively developed, and insinuating itself more deeply into the prevalent modes of thinking, appear in greater strength. Even by this wise settlement of the question, so serious a breach could not be repaired, if not fundamentally rectified by the operation of that Spirit from whom this settlement proceeded. As those who were addicted to Pharisaism were, from the first, accustomed to esteem a Christianity amalgamated with complete Judaism, as alone genuine and perfect, and rendering men capable of enjoying all the privileges of the kingdom of God, it was hardly possible that these decisions could produce an entire revolution in their mode of thinking; whether it was that they soon ceased to pay regard to the decisions of the assembly at Jerusalem, or that they explained them according to their own views and interests, as if indeed, though they had not commanded the observance of the law to Gentile Christians, they were designed to intimate that it would be to their advantage, if voluntarily, and out of love to Jehovah, they observed the whole law. And as they had not hesitated, before the assembly was called at Jerusalem, to appeal to the authority of the apostles, although they were by no means authorized to do so, they again attempted to make use of this expedient, of which they could more readily avail themselves on account of the great distance of most of the Gentile churches from Jerusalem.

Thus we have here the first example of an accommodation of differences which arose in the development of the church, an attempt to effect a union of two contending parties; and we here see what has been often repeated, that union can only be attained where it proceeds from an in-

* See page 27.

ternal unity of Christian consciousness; but where the reconciliation is only external, the deeply-seated differences, though for a brief period repressed, will soon break out afresh. But what is of the greatest importance, we here behold the *seal of true catholicism* publicly exhibited by the apostles, and the genuine apostolic church. The existence of the genuine catholic church, which so deeply-seated a division threatened to destroy, was thereby secured.

We are now arrived at a point of time in which the Gentile church assumed a peculiar and independent form; we will, therefore, before tracing its further spread and development in connexion with the labors of Paul, first glance at the constitution of the church in this new form of Christian fellowship.

CHAPTER V.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH, AND THE ECCLESIASTICAL USAGES OF THE GENTILE CHRISTIANS.

THE forms under which the polity of the Christian community at first developed itself, were, as we have before remarked, very nearly resembling those which already existed in the Jewish church. But these forms, adopted by Jewish Christians, would not have been transferred to the Gentile churches, if they had not so closely corresponded to the nature of the Christian community as to furnish a model for its organization. This *peculiar nature* of the Christian community was that which distinguished the Christian church from all other religious associations, and which especially showed itself after Christianity had burst the fetters of Judaism, among the free and independent churches of the Gentile Christians. Since Christ had satisfied once for all that religious need, from the sense of which a priesthood has every where originated,—that need of mediation grounded in man's consciousness of separation from God by sin—there was no longer room or necessity for any other priesthood. If, in the Apostolic Epistles, the Old Testament ideas of a priesthood, a priestly cultus and sacrifices are applied to the new economy, it is only with the design of showing, that, since Christ has for ever accomplished that which the priesthood and sacrifices in the Old Testament prefigured, the reconciliation of God to men,—all who now appropriate by faith what he effected for mankind, stand in the same relation to God, without needing any other mediation; that they are all by communion with Christ dedicated and consecrated to God, and are called to present their whole lives to God as an acceptable, spiritual thank-offering; that their whole consecrated activity is a true spiritual, priestly cultus, Christians forming a divine kingdom of priests. Rom. xii. 1; 1 Peter ii. 9. This idea of

the gospel priesthood of all Christians, proceeding from the consciousness of redemption, and grounded alone in that, is partly stated and developed in express terms, and partly presupposed in the epithets, images, and comparisons, applied to the Christian life.

As all believers were conscious of an equal relation to Christ as their Redeemer, and of a common participation of communion with God obtained through him; so on this consciousness an equal relation of believers to one another was grounded, which utterly precluded any relation like that found in other forms of religion, subsisting between a priestly caste and a people of whom they were the mediators and spiritual guides. The apostles even were very far from placing themselves in a relation to believers which bore any resemblance to a mediating priesthood; in this respect they always placed themselves on a footing of equality. If Paul assured the church of his intercessory prayers for them, he in return requested their prayers for himself. There were accordingly no persons in the Christian church, who, like the priests of antiquity, claimed the possession of an esoteric doctrine, while they kept the people in a state of spiritual pupillage and dependence on themselves, as their sole guides and instructors in religious matters. Such a relation would have been inconsistent with the consciousness of an equal dependence on Christ, and an equal relation to him as participating in the same spiritual life. The first Pentecost had given evidence that a consciousness of the higher life proceeding from communion with Christ filled all believers, and similar effects were produced at every season of Christian awakening which preceded the formation of a church. The apostle Paul, in the 4th chapter of his Epistle to the Galatians, points out as a common feature of Judaism and heathenism, the condition of pupillage, of bondage to outward ordinances. He represents this bondage and pupillage as taken away by the consciousness of redemption, and that the same spirit ought to be in all Christians. He contrasts the heathen, who blindly followed their priests, and gave themselves up to all their arts of deception, with true Christians, who, by faith in the Redeemer, have themselves become the organs of the Divine Spirit, and can hear the voice of the living God within them; 1 Cor. xii. 1. He even thought that he should assume too much to himself, if, in relation to a church already grounded in spiritual things, he represented himself only as giving; for in this respect there should be only one general giver, the Saviour himself, as the source of all life in the church, while all others, as members of the spiritual body animated by him the Head, should stand to each other in the mutual relation of givers and receivers. Hence it was, that after he had written to the Romans that he longed to come to them in order to impart some spiritual gift for their establishment, he added, lest he should seem to arrogate too much to himself, "that is, that I may be comforted, together with you, by the *mutual* faith both of you and me;" Rom. i. 12.

Christianity, on the one hand, by the Holy Spirit as the common

•

higher principle of life, gave to the church a unity, lifted above every other principle of union among men, destined to subordinate to itself, and in this subordination to adjust and harmonize, all the varieties founded in the development of human nature. But, on the other hand, mental peculiarities were not annihilated by this divine life, since, in all cases, it followed the laws of the natural development of man; but it rather purified, sanctified, and transformed them, and promoted their freer and more complete expansion. This higher unity of life was to exhibit itself in a multiplicity of individualities, animated by the Spirit, and forming reciprocal complements to each other as parts of one vast whole in the kingdom of God. Consequently, the manner in which this divine life expressed and manifested itself in each, must be determined by the previous mental individuality of each. It is true the apostle Paul says, "But all these worketh that one and self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he *will*," 1 Cor. xii. 11; but it by no means follows, that he supposes an operation of the Divine Spirit totally unconditioned. In this passage, he is simply opposing an arbitrary human valuation, which would attribute a worth to only certain gifts of grace, and refused to acknowledge the manifoldness in their distribution. The analogy to the members of the human body, of which the apostle afterwards avails himself, betokens the not arbitrary but regulated development of the new creation in a sanctified natural order; for it is evident from this analogy, that as, among the members of the human body, each has its determinate place assigned by nature, and its appropriate function, so also the divine life, in its development, follows a similar law, grounded on the natural relations of the individual qualities animated by it.

From what has just been said, we are prepared for rightly understanding the idea of *charism*, so very important for the history of the development of the Christian life, and of the constitution of the Christian church in the first ages. In the apostolic age, it denoted nothing else than the predominant capability of an individual in which the power and operation of the Holy Spirit that animated him was revealed;* whether this capability appeared as something communicated in an immediate manner by the Holy Spirit, or whether it was already existing in the individual before his conversion, and animated, sanctified, and elevated by the new principle of life, was to serve one common and supreme object, the inward and outward development of the kingdom of God, or the church of Christ.† That which is the soul of the whole Christian life,

* The "manifestation of the Spirit," (φανέρωσις τοῦ πνεύματος) peculiar to each person.

† The word most generally used, whereby (since Paul has used it in this sense) is signified all that concerns the internal advancement of the kingdom of God—whether in reference to the church in general, or to individuals—is "to edify," (οικοδομεῖν.) This use of the word arises from the practice of comparing the Christian life of the whole church, and its individual members, to a building, a temple of God which is built on the foundation on which this building necessarily rests, 1 Cor. iii. 9, 10, and is in a state of continual progress towards completion. On this progressive building of the temple of

and forms its inward unity, the faith working by love, can never appear as a particular charism; for as this it is which forms the essence of the whole Christian disposition, so it is this which must govern all the particular Christian capabilities; and it is because they are all regulated by this common principle of the Christian disposition, that the particular capabilities become charisms; 1 Cor. xiii; which Schleiermacher also acknowledges in his work on Christian Morals, p. 308. Yet we cannot perfectly agree with him when he asserts that the predominant Christian idea for everything which can be called virtue in the higher sense of the word, is *χάρισμα*. It is true, that inasmuch, as along with the Christian disposition all the virtues pertaining to its practical exemplification in life are not given at once—inasmuch as its development is gradual, and as hence it may follow, that in the unity of the same disposition, one virtue may predominate in one person, and another in another, the name Charism may be applied to the prominent virtue. Yet this difference is found to exist: for the full soundness of the Christian life in every man, and for the good success of every labor for the kingdom of God, the co-operation of all the fundamental or cardinal virtues is required; but the same cannot be said of all the peculiar capabilities which are marked by the name of Charisms, lying outside the department of morals, although appropriated by it. Thus it cannot be laid down as a requirement, that they should all be found together in every individual. Rather is this excluded by the idea of individuality. Peculiar charisms belong to one, which do not exist in others; and this indicates the need of individuals having their deficiencies made up by others, like the collective members of one body; to the soundness of the body belongs the conjoined organism of all the charisms which the divine life of Christianity appropriates from the collective life of humanity.

That by which the developed natural endowment becomes a charism, and which is common to all, is always something elevated above the common course of nature, something divine. But the *forms* of manifestation in which this higher principle exhibited itself were different, according as they were the result of an original creative operation of the Holy Spirit, entering into and appropriating the course of nature, as they were something immediately *worked*, (though even here a hidden connexion might exist between the natural peculiarities of the individual and such a special acting of the Holy Spirit)—the charisms which in the New Testament, are called “powers, signs, wonders,” *δυνάμεις, σημεῖα, τέρατα* or, according as they were the result of the development of natural talents under the animating influence of the Holy Spirit. The first kind of charisms belongs more to the *peculiar* operation of the Holy Spirit *in the apostolic age, that peculiarly creative epoch of Christianity on its first appearance in the world*; the second kind belongs to the operation of

God, both in general and individually, see the admirable remarks in Nitsch's *Observationes ad Theologiam practicam feliciter excolendam*. Bonn, 1831, p. 21.

the Holy Spirit through all succeeding ages of the church, by which human nature, in its essential qualities and its whole course of development, will be progressively penetrated and transformed. It is true, therefore, that these two forms of charism, as they were manifested in the apostolic church, are clearly distinguishable; the gift, indeed, by which effects were produced in the visible world, which could not proceed from the existing powers and laws of nature, the gift of *δυνάμεις*, and one still more definite, that of curing diseases, the *χάρισμα λαμάτων*, are called special gifts; 1 Cor. xii. 9, 10. But these gifts are only special as coördinate with others; we find no division of gifts into two classes, extraordinary and ordinary, supernatural and natural; for we contemplate the apostolic church from the right point of view, only when we consider the essential in all these gifts to be the supernatural principle, the divine element of life itself. Just as all Christian truths, so far as they belong to the sphere of the new higher life which the Holy Spirit alone can disclose, are called "Mysteries."

The charisms which appeared in the apostolic church, may be most naturally divided into such as relate to the furtherance of the kingdom of God or the edification of the church, *by the word*, and such as relate to the furtherance of the kingdom of God by other kinds of outward* agency. As to the first class, a distinction may be made, founded on the varying relation which the self-activity, developed in the several powers of the soul and their performances, bore to the inworking of the Holy Spirit; varying as the immediate force of inspiration predominated in the higher self-consciousness (the *νοῦς* or *πνεῦμα*), and the lower self-consciousness (the *ψυχὴ*), the medium of the soul's intercourse with the outward world, was repressed; or as the communications of the Divine Spirit were received under the harmonious operation of *all* the powers of the soul, and were developed and employed by the coöperating sober exercise of the understanding.†

Hence the gradations in the charisms of which we have already spoken, p. 35, the charism of "speaking with tongues," of "prophesying," and of "teaching." Men who were prepared by the early cultivation of the intellect, and the aptitude for mental communication, knew how to develop and communicate in logical consecutiveness what the illumination of the Divine Spirit revealed to their higher self-consciousness. The *διδάσκαλοι* are therefore teachers possessed of Christian knowledge (*γνῶσις*) gained by means of a self-activity animated by the Holy Spirit, by the development and elaboration of truth discerned in the divine light. The prophet, on the contrary, spoke as he was carried away by the power of inspira-

* Compare 1 Pet. iv. 11.

† We can here make use of what Synesius in his *Dion* says of the relation of the Bacchic frenzy, *βακχεΐα*—of the "mad leap," *ἄλμα μανικόν*, of the "possession by a god," *θεοφόρητον*—to the completeness of the "moderate and controlled power," *μέση καὶ ἐπιστατικὴ δύναμις*.

tion, suddenly, by an instantaneous elevation of his higher self-consciousness, according to a light that then gleamed upon him, an ἀποκάλυψις. The prophet may be distinguished from the teacher in reference to his mental peculiarity and structure, by the predominance, in general, of the feelings and intuitive perceptions over the activity of the understanding. Yet the two charisms were not always found separate and in different persons. The teacher in many a moment of inspiration might become a prophet. The prophet might pronounce, under the influence of inspiration, some impressive address, to awaken, to admonish, to warn, or to console the assembled believers; or make appeals to those who were not yet decided in the faith, to startle their consciences and thus open their hearts for the instructions of the teacher. It is evident what influence the power of inspired discourse, operating on the heart, must have had for the spread of the gospel during this period. Persons who wished only for once to inform themselves respecting what occurred in the Christian assemblies, or to become acquainted with the Christian doctrine, of whose divine origin they were as yet by no means convinced, sometimes came into the assemblies of the Church.* On these occa-

* The ἄπιστος, 1 Cor. xiv. 24, means a person not yet a believer, but yet not unsuspceptible of faith, the *infidelis negative*. Such a one might be awakened to believe by "prophecy," προφητεία. The ἄπιστος, 1 Cor. xiv. 22, is an obstinate unbeliever, wholly unsuspceptible of faith, and hence utterly unsuspceptible of the influence of the προφητεία, an *infidelis privative*. For such persons there could be no awakening, but only condemnatory "signs," σημεῖα. I am not induced by what Meyer has said, in his Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, to give up this interpretation. The connexion makes it absolutely necessary, to give a different meaning to ἄπιστος in 1 Cor. xiv. 23 and 24, from that given to it in v. 22, and the collocation of ἰδιῶται and ἄπιστοι confirms this explanation. The two words are associated as designations of related states, or of the same state in different relations. The ἰδιῶται were those who knew only a little of Christianity, the ἄπιστοι those who had not yet attained to faith, and as not believing, were akin to the class mentioned in v. 22, but distinguished from them by the direction of their disposition, and its relation to believing, inasmuch as they were not in the position of decided enmity to Christianity. The fact of their attending Christian assemblies, bore evidence of their seeking after truth, and of at least a dawning susceptibility. A person of this class comes to the Christian assemblies to learn, whether it be really a matter worth attending to, "moved to inquire what there is in the matter," *accensus inquirere quid sit in causa*, as Tertullian says. The train of thought is as follows: v. 21, God speaks by people using a strange language (the revelation of his judgment) to the Jews, who would not listen to the prophets speaking to them in their own language; v. 22, thus the unintelligible tongues are for signs (signs of merited divine judgments, condemnatory signs) not for believers, (which idea is amplified in verses 23, 24, that it may be applied also to those who are susceptible of faith, whose minds are somewhat moved to believe,) but for unbelievers (by which is indicated a positive opposition to faith—the position of those who have obstinately rejected the opportunities of attaining faith). But prophecy is not for the unbelieving (in consequence of the opposition of their hearts), but for believers. Of course, Paul does not mean to say here that prophecy is designed only for believers, and not also for unbelievers, so far as these include such as have only not yet attained to faith; for it is clear that prophecy was especially fitted to arouse and alarm those who, though not yet believing, were possessed of susceptible minds; to excite in them a sense of sin, and

sions, Christian men came forward who testified with overpowering energy, of the corruption of human nature, and of the universal need of redemption; and, from their own religious and moral consciousness, appealed to that of others, as if they could read it. The heathen felt his conscience struck, his heart was laid open, and he was forced to acknowledge, what hitherto he had not been willing to believe, that the power of God was with this doctrine, and dwelt among these men; 1 Cor. xiv. 25.

If the connected addresses of the "*teacher*," διδάσκαλος, tended to lead those further into a knowledge of the gospel who had already attained to faith, or to develop in their minds the clear understanding of what they had received by faith; "*prophesying*," προφητεία, served rather to awaken those to faith who were not yet believers, or to animate and strengthen those who had attained to faith, to quicken afresh the life of faith. On the contrary, in the "*speaking with tongues*," γλώσσαις λαλεῖν, the elevated consciousness of God alone prevailed, while the consciousness of the external world vanished. To a person in exercise of this gift, the medium of communication between the external world and his deeply moved soul, was altogether wanting. What he uttered in this state when carried away by his feelings and intuitions, was not a connected address like that of a διδάσκαλος, nor was it an exhortation suited to the circumstances of other persons (παράκλησις), like that of the prophets; but without being capable of taking notice of the mental state and necessities of others, he was occupied solely with the relation of his own heart to God. His soul was absorbed in devotion and adoration. Hence prayer, singing the praises of God, testifying of the mighty acts of God, were suited to this state.* Such a person prayed in the

of the need of redemption, and to lead them to a recognition of the divine power of the gospel. It follows, therefore, of itself, that the term "believer" here could not have been set in general antithesis to all who had not yet attained to faith, but in more restricted opposition to decided unbelievers—to such as *would not believe*. This general position, that not the gift of unintelligible tongues, but prophecy speaking intelligibly to them, was designed for believers, the apostle lays down in v. 23, as an inference from what he had said before. But instead of taking an example from those who already belonged to the church as decided believers, he takes an example from those who were only in their progress towards believing; since in these the truth of what he had asserted was more strikingly evident, showing how many such persons might be won by prophecy, and on the contrary, how injuriously the sight of an assembly in which they heard nothing but ecstatic, unintelligible discourses must operate upon them; in the latter case, they would feel themselves compelled to suppose that there was nothing in Christianity but delusion and fanaticism. But if the same unbelievers were intended in verse 23 as in verse 22, then for such also the discourses of the prophets would be nothing that could profit them, since there was no point of connexion in their dispositions. To them also, what they heard spoken by the prophets would appear nothing but fanaticism. It would be a punishment merited by them, to be addressed in unintelligible language. Since they *would not understand*—they *should not understand*.

* As various kinds of religious acts might proceed from this state of mind, (as for instance, praying and singing with the Spirit,) the plural *tongues*, and the phrase "*kind of tongues*," are used.

Spirit; the higher life of the mind and heart predominated, but the intelligent development was wanting.* Since he formed a peculiar language for himself, from his own individual feelings and intuitions, he was deficient in the ability to express himself so as to be understood by the majority. Had the apostle Paul held the "speaking with tongues" to be something quite fanatical and morbid, neither advantageous for the Christian life of the individual nor for the furtherance of the Christian life in others, he certainly (liberally as he always acknowledged what was good in the churches to whom he wrote, before he blamed what was evil) would never have allowed himself to designate by the name of a charism, an imperfection in the Christian life, and never could he, in this case, have said of himself that he thanked God that he spake in more tongues than all of them. On the contrary, from the view here developed of this charism, it is evident that, in this extraordinary elevation of mind, he recognised an operation of the Divine Spirit, a special gift of grace; and there is also an internal probability that *that* apostle, who rose to the

* At all events it is certain that in 1 Cor. xiv. 14, *praying and singing with the Spirit*, πνεύματι προσεύχεσθαι, ψάλλειν, is equally with "speaking with a tongue," γλώσσαις λαλεῖν, opposed to "speaking in, or with the understanding," τῷ νοῷ or διὰ τοῦ νοῦ λαλεῖν, and it is certain that the latter means—to deliver something through the medium of thinking, in a form proceeding from a sound consciousness. But it may be disputed—which, however, decides nothing respecting the subject as a whole—whether πνεῦμα in this whole section is a designation of the ecstatic state, as one in which the excitation produced by the Divine Spirit, the immediate inspiration predominates, and the human self-activity is repressed; or whether it denotes also a peculiar internal power of human nature, the power of higher intuition, which in such states alone is developed and active. Verses 15 and 16 would favor and justify no other interpretation than the former. But in verse 14, though this interpretation is not impossible, there are some difficulties; for then by the πνεῦμα here would have to be understood the inspiration effected by the Spirit, as something abiding in the soul, and completely blended with the subjective. Instead of saying, I pray in inspiration, Paul would say, My spirit (*that* in me which is one with the Spirit acting within me) prays. It cannot be denied that this interpretation has something harsh, which is not found, if, according to the second, we understand by πνεῦμα that highest power of the soul, which in those highest moments of the inner life is active as the organ for the influences of the Divine Spirit. It cannot at least be decisive against this interpretation, that Paul in his Epistle to the Romans generally designates the higher spiritual nature of man by the term νοῦς; for this need not prevent his applying the same name to a more limited idea in another connexion; the νοῦς — τὸ νοοῦν, the discursive faculty of thought, in distinction from the higher faculty of intuition, which, surrendering itself to the Divine Spirit, is more receptive. It is worthy of remark, and assists in forming a right judgment of the various charisms in relation to Christianity, that in the sense assigned to the γλώσσαις λαλεῖν, we may find something analogous in the "frenzy," μανία, the "inspiration," ἐνθουσιασμός, of the heathen "diviner," μάντις; on the contrary, in the διδασκαλία is presented a characteristic of Christianity, the religion of sober-mindedness; as Christianity is the religion of freedom of mental self-activity, (in opposition to mere passivity,) and of harmonious mental development. Hence, also, the danger that—when a one-sided over-valuation of the γλώσσαις λαλεῖν gained ground, and there was a defect in Christian watchfulness and sobriety, as in heathenism—the excitement of mere natural feeling might injuriously mingle itself with the movements of the divine life, as was the case in Montanism, in which we may observe appearances akin to somnambulism.

highest point of the interior Christian life, who could depose to having received so many "visions," *ὀπτασίαι*, and "revelations of the Lord," *ἀποκαλύψεις κυρίου*, who had heard things unutterable in any tongue of men—had often been in circumstances corresponding to the *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν*. But it was consonant with that wisdom which always took account of the interests of all classes in the church, that he—although he recognised the value of these temporary elevations for the whole of the Christian life, by which it was enabled to take a wider range—left the manifestations of such moments rather to the private devotions of each individual, and banished them from meetings for general edification; that he valued more highly those spiritual gifts, which gave scope for the harmonious coöperation of all the powers of the soul, and contributed in the spirit of love to the general edification; and that he dreaded the danger of self-deception and fanaticism, where the extraordinary manifestations of the Christian life were overvalued, and where that which only had worth when it arose unsought from the interior development of life, became an object of anxious pursuit to many who were thus brought into a state of morbid excitement. Hence he wished, that in those highest moments of inspiration which attended the speaking with tongues, each one would pour out his heart alone before God; but that in the assemblies of the church these manifestations of devotion, unintelligible to the majority, might be repressed, or only be exhibited when what was thus spoken could be translated into a language intelligible to all.

Among these charisms, we have further to distinguish the gift of a divinely animated creative power of the religious intuition, and the gift which enabled a person to explain or to pass judgment upon what others communicated in the state of higher inspiration—the faculty, animated by the Divine Spirit, of interpreting or of judging, the "interpretation of tongues," *ἐρμηνεία γλώσσων*, and the "trying of spirits," *διάκρισις πνευμάτων*. The Christian life was permitted freely to develop and express itself in the church. Whoever felt an inward impulse, might speak in the Christian assemblies; but sound discretion was to accompany inspiration, and even be considered as a mark of its genuineness. No one was to wish to be the sole speaker; or to interrupt others in speaking; 1 Cor. xiv. 30, 31. If Paul considered such injunctions to be necessary, it is apparent that he by no means recognised in the prophets of the church such pure organs of the Divine Spirit, as that the divine and the human might not easily be mixed in them. On the contrary, the churches were to be guarded against the excesses of such a mixture and the delusions which abound when human impurity is looked upon as a suggestion of the Divine Spirit,—by exercising a trial of spirits, for which a special gift was granted to individuals. As for the *διδάσκαλος*, in whom the reflective activity of the understanding predominated, the gift of trying spirits was not required so much to accompany his addresses; for since in him the critical power was developed and active, and he was habitu-

ated to discuss Christian truths with a sober judgment, he was able to judge himself. But the less a prophet in the moments of inspiration was himself able to observe, to examine, and to judge, the greater was the danger of confounding the divine and the human, and the more necessary was it, to prevent this, for others to apply a scrutiny.

On this account, it was necessary that the operations of the prophetic gift should be attended by an extraordinary endowment, in certain persons, of trying the spirits, a critical power animated by the Holy Spirit. The design of this gift was certainly not merely nor specially to decide who was a prophet and who was not; but also chiefly for the purpose of distinguishing in the addresses of those who stood up as inspired speakers in the Christian assemblies, between what proceeded from the Divine Spirit, and what did not proceed from that source; so Paul, on this point, recommended the church to try every thing communicated by the prophets, and required them to separate the good from the bad; 1 Thess. v. 21. And as the prophets did not pretend to be infallible, but were conscious of their liability to error, they submitted themselves to the judgment of the church, or of their organs appointed for the purpose, and thus were preserved from the self-delusion of pride, that fruitful source of fanatical error. We see how already are foreshadowed in these peculiar operations of the Divine Spirit who animated the church in these original charisms, the various activities which would afterwards be animated by Christianity, and which belong to the perfect development of the reason, such as the exposition of what is written or spoken by others, and criticism.

In the charism of "teaching" itself, we find again a difference in reference to the "word of knowledge," *λόγος γνώσεως*, and the "word of wisdom," *λόγος σοφίας*. It is evident, from the manner in which they are mentioned separately (1 Cor. xii. 8), that there is a certain distinction between them, but it is very difficult to ascertain what it is. Elsewhere the word *γνώσις* denotes the theoretical in distinction from the practical, and relates to the intellectual development of Christian truth. Thus the Corinthians boasted of their gnosis, because they had obtained many deductions from Christian truth which had not yet become clear to others who were too closely confined to their former point of view. And Paul does not deny that they were before many in point of knowledge; only he missed in them that humility and love, without which all knowledge in reference to divine things is worthless. He joins together in 1 Cor. xiii. 2, "understanding all mysteries and having all knowledge." But the idea of "wisdom," *σοφία*, also might seem to relate to the intellectual. Aristotle makes the distinction between *σοφία* and *φρόνησις*, that the former refers to the eternal and divine, but the latter to the useful for man. But the contrast here made by that great teacher, closely depends, with his whole mode of contemplation, on the relation of the divine to the human, and on the boundaries of morals. In common language, certainly the distinction between the ideas of *σοφὸς* and *φρόνιμος* often

vanishes, and the former term is used to designate any knowledge or skill in the department of practice.

In the First Epistle to the Corinthians Paul distinguishes by the name of "the wisdom of the perfect" a more profound development of Christian truth, by means of which it is shown that what natural reason represents as foolishness, contains in itself inexhaustible treasures of wisdom. But the same Paul also uses the word *σοφία* in cases which relate altogether to the practical, and where it corresponds rather to prudence. Both senses meet in the idea of Christian wisdom, of which we shall speak in the chapter on doctrine.

By reverting to the peculiar idea of wisdom, and endeavoring to investigate what Paul designates "the wisdom of the perfect," may we not obtain an accommodation between the theoretical and the practical, by which *σοφία* is distinguished from *γνῶσις*? The idea of wisdom bespeaks an activity of the mind directed toward an end, and hence refers to those acts by which the ideas originating within are brought forth into outward visibility. As now, according to Paul, the highest end of creation in reference to this world can be attained only by the redemption of mankind, so the Divine wisdom reveals itself especially in the manner in which the various generations of men are brought to a participation in redemption, in the manifold steps of the course of development, which under the Divine guidance conducts all things to just that end. Rom. xi. 33; Eph. iii. 10. Thus the wisdom of the perfect has for its functions and objects, to produce the conviction, that in the relation which the development of humanity bears to the appearance of Christ, and to the redemption accomplished through his sufferings, the Divine wisdom reveals itself; and that the preaching, therefore, which appears as foolishness to those who are without the pale of Christianity, gives the most abundant disclosures of the Divine wisdom, as in the unveiling of that hidden design of redemption all the treasures of wisdom are contained. With this idea, what is represented in the Epistle to the Hebrews as the doctrine of perfection, may be placed in connexion. And thus the *λόγος σοφίας* would be applied to a special department of knowledge as distinguished from the universality of the gnosis. But if the wisdom that guides human life and determines human action is to form itself according to the doctrine of Divine wisdom; if the new mode of treating all the relations of life proceeds from that which "the wisdom of the perfect" teaches us to recognise as the central point of all history; if this is to be the central point also for the whole moral structure of life; then, therefore, the ethical element also, the more practical, in distinction from the more theoretical gnosis, would here find its point of connexion.

Let us now proceed from those gifts which relate to the ministry of the word, to that class which relates to other kinds of outward activity for the advancement of the kingdom of God. Here again we must distinguish between those in which, as in "teaching," a peculiar

capability founded in human nature, and developed and applied according to its usual laws, was rendered effective, under the influence of a new divine principle of life; and those in which the natural human development was repressed, and what was purely divine became more prominent, as in the "speaking with tongues" and "prophesying." To the former belong the gifts of church government, the *χάρισμα κυβερνήσεως* or *τοῦ προιστάναι*, and the gifts for various services, which were required in administering the concerns of the church, as distributing alms, tending the sick, &c., the *χάρισμα διακονίας* or *ἀντιλήψεως*; 1 Cor. xii. 28; Rom. xii. 7. To the second division belongs especially the gift of working miracles, and performing cures. The charism from which these two modes of miraculous operation proceed, considered in its essential nature, appears to be "faith," *πίστις*; 1 Cor. xii. 9; xiii. 2; Matt. xvii. 20; for the term *πίστις* in this connection cannot denote Christian faith in general, the disposition common to all Christians; but must necessarily relate to something special. For, as seems to appear from the relation of *πίστις* to these two modes of operation, in which a peculiar power of the will over nature manifests itself; and as is confirmed by what is predicated of *πίστις* in 1 Cor. xiii. 2: "If I had faith so that I could move mountains," *i. e.* could render what appeared impossible, possible by the power of religious conviction working on the Will,—the term *πίστις* denotes the practical power of the will animated and elevated by faith. But with this variety in the manifestations of the charisms, he who labored in the service of the church yet affirmed with the worker of miracles, that he was conscious that everything effected by him was solely by the power of God granted to him; 1 Pet. iv. 11.

Although, as we have shown, in virtue of these spiritual gifts imparted to individuals, according to their various peculiarities, no one was to exercise a one-sided influence on the church, but rather all with reciprocal activity were to coöperate for the one object, under the influence of one head animating the whole in all its manifold members, Eph. iv. 16; yet it by no means follows that all guidance* of the church by human in-

* We cannot, in this place, allow the view brought forward by Baur, in his treatise on the "Pastoralbriefe," p. 79, to pass unnoticed, that, in the genuine Pauline Epistles, no trace can be found of distinct employments and offices for the guidance and government of the church. The passage in Rom. xii., in which the distinctions in the various charisms are pointed out, certainly shows how fluctuating everything was at that time, and how little idea can be formed from those charisms as to the meaning of the later church-offices corresponding to them. It is certainly striking to notice how Paul, in the 8th and 9th verses of that passage in the Epistle to the Romans, passes from the charisms which seem to relate to particular offices, to the mention of Christian virtues which concerned every believer; at the end of verse 8, the "showing mercy," *ἐλεῶν*, forms the point of transition, and even before that, "giving," *μεταδίδους*, does not necessarily relate to any official duty. Thus it might be concluded that the original constitution of the churches among Gentile Christians, in the apostolic age, was entirely democratic, and also that this was one of the distinguishing marks between the churches of Gentile and those of Jewish origin. The matter would then have to be looked at thus: All the affairs of the churches were

strumentality was excluded; but only that these specially guiding instruments exercised no exclusive authority, did not separate themselves from connexion with the whole living organization formed by a free reciprocal action of the individual members, nor dared to violate their relation to the other members, as equally serving the same Head and the same body.

still transacted in an entirely public manner, so that every deliberative meeting of the church resembled a strictly popular assembly. But it happened of course that although no definite offices were instituted, to which certain employments were exclusively attached, yet each one occupied himself with those matters for which he possessed a peculiar charism; those who had the gift of teaching, generally attended to teaching,—those who possessed the gift of church government, occupied themselves with the duties pertaining to it. Thus, in every meeting of the church, there would be of course, a division among its members of the various business, according to the peculiar charisms of individuals, without the institution, however, of any definite church-offices. In favor of this view, it might further be alleged, that, when Paul (1 Cor. vi.) speaks of a matter belonging to church government, the settling of litigations, he does not recommend their committing this business to persons who held a distinct office of governing, whose concern in that case it would have been; but speaks of the church as a body, before whose tribunal such disputes ought to be brought to a decision. “Is there not *one* wise man among you,” he asked, “who can settle such matters?” Therefore such wise persons, or in other words, those who had the gift of church government, were to be taken from the midst of the church itself, to undertake the settlement of these disputes by means of their peculiar charism; no distinct church office could have been here referred to. But this opinion, which might be formed from such passages, though not necessarily founded upon them, is decidedly opposed by others. Paul, in 1 Cor. xvi., says, that the family of Stephanas, as the first Christian family in Achaia, devoted themselves to the service of the Christian church, *i. e.* its members declared themselves ready to undertake church offices; consequently, we may suppose that, at the founding of the church, such offices were instituted. That this is his meaning, is confirmed by the 16th verse, where Paul exhorts the church to obey such ministers, (therefore rulers of the church), and all their follow-laborers.

Further, in 1 Thess. v. 12, he speaks of those who labored for the church, presided over it, and admonished it. Love to them as overseers on account of their laborious calling is particularly enjoined; and with this is connected the exhortation to peace with one another, since division in the church would especially injure their proper relation to these overseers of the church, and the want of becoming love and reverence towards them would also injuriously operate against the unity of the church. Also, when Paul, in Rom. xvi. 1, mentions a deaconess, it is certainly presupposed that there were deacons and presbyters in the church. And when, in Eph. iv. 11, he names pastors and teachers next to apostles and prophets, and indeed after the mention of charisms as the heavenly gifts bestowed by Christ, we must infer that, among these pastors and teachers, there were those who exercised distinct offices, and that, in general, certain offices corresponded to certain charisms. We intentionally pass over Philip. i. 1, a passage which can be decisive only for those who, like myself, are convinced of the genuineness of the epistle. Also, when Luke, Acts xiv. 23, narrates that Paul, on his first missionary journey, appointed presbyters in the new churches, this is, in my opinion, certain historical evidence, since I must consider the suspicion that in this work a later ecclesiastical point of view has been transferred to earlier and differently formed church-relations, as absolutely without foundation. But from the existing relations of the churches at that time, when there was not in the same sense as in later times a clergy distinguished from the laity, it is evident, how, in Rom. xii. 7, along with the charisms connected with specific offices, those might be named which were

There was indeed for this guidance a peculiar talent inspired by the Holy Spirit, the "gift of government," (*χάρισμα κυβερνήσεως*.) It was this that fitted a person for the office of presiding over the church. The name of presbyter, by which, as we have before remarked, this office was first distinguished, was transferred from the Jewish synagogue to the Christian church. But when the church extended itself further among Hellenic Gentiles, with this name borrowed from the civil and religious constitution of the Jews another was joined, which was more allied to the designations of social relations among the Greeks, and adapted to point out the official duties connected with the dignity of presbyters.* The name *ἐπίσκοποι* denoted overseers over the whole of the church and its collective concerns; as in Attica those who were commissioned to organize the states dependent on Athens, received the title of *ἐπίσκοποι*,† and as in general it appears to have been a frequent one for denoting a guiding oversight in the public administration.‡ Since, then, the name "overseer or bishop," (*ἐπίσκοπος*) was no other than a transference of an original Jewish and Hellenistic designation of office, adapted to the social relations of the Gentiles; it follows that originally both names related entirely to the same office, and hence both names are frequently interchanged as perfectly synonymous. Thus Paul addresses the assembled presbyters of the Ephesian church, whom he had sent for, as *ἐπισκόπους*;§ so likewise in 1 Tim. iii. 1, the office of the presbyters is called

not so connected; and how Paul could pass on from particular charisms to general Christian virtues. Attention to the poor and sick, which belonged to the special business of deacons, was yet something in which others could be employed, besides those on whom it officially devolved. See Rothe, in the work before quoted, p. 189.

* The apostle Peter, in his first Epistle (v. 1, 2), certainly distinguishes this dignity by the name "elders," (*πρεσβύτεροι*), but the duties connected with it, by the term "to oversee," = "to feed," (*ἐπισκοπεῖν* = *ποιμαίνειν*.)

† Otherwise called "governors," *ἄρμοσταί*. Schol. *Aristoph. Av.* (1023): *οἱ παρ' Ἀθηναίων εἰς τὰς ὑπηκόους πόλεις ἐπισκέψασθαι τὰ παρ' ἐκύστοις πεμπόμενοι, Ἐπίσκοποι καὶ φύλακες ἐκαλοῦντο, οὓς οἱ Λάκωνες Ἀρμοστὰς ἔλεγον.* (Those sent by the Athenians to subject cities, to inspect affairs among them, were called overseers and protectors, whom the Laconians called Governors.)

‡ *Cic. ad Atticum*, vii. Ep. 11. *Vult me Pompeius esse, quem tota hæc Campana et maritima ora habeat ἐπίσκοπον, ad quem delectus et summa negotii referatur.* (Pompey wishes me to be the overseer (*ἐπίσκοπον*), whom all this Campana and these maritime borders have, to whom select and important matters may be referred.) In a fragment of a work by *Arcadius Charisius de Muneribus civilibus*, *Episcopi qui præsumt pani et cæteris venalibus rebus, quæ civitatum populis ad quotidianum victum usui sunt.* (Overseers who have charge of the bread and other things for sale, which are used by the people of the cities for daily food.) *Digest. lib. iv. tit. iv. leg. 18, § 7.*

§ Acts xx. 17, 28. If we believed ourselves justified in supposing that among them, there were not merely the overseers of the Ephesian church, but also those of other churches in Lesser Asia, it might be said, that by these "bishops," *ἐπισκόπους*, only the presidents of the presbyteries are intended. But the other passages in Paul's epistles are against such a distinction, and Luke, who applied this address only to the overseers of the Ephesian church, still considered, therefore, the terms *ἐπίσκοπος* and *πρεσβύτερος* as perfectly synonymous.

ἐπισκοπή), and immediately after (verse 8) the office of deacons is mentioned as the only existing church-office besides, as also in Philip. i. 1. And thus Paul enjoins Titus to appoint presbyters, and immediately after calls them bishops. It is, therefore, certain that every church was governed by a union of the elders or overseers* chosen from among themselves, and we find among them no individual distinguished above the rest who presided as a *primus inter pares*, though probably, in the age immediately succeeding the apostolic, of which we have unfortunately so few authentic memorials, the practice was introduced of applying to such an one the name of ἐπίσκοπος by way of distinction.† We have no information how the office of president in the deliberations of presbyters was held in the apostolic age. Possibly this office was held in rotation—or perhaps the order of seniority was followed—or, by degrees, one individual by his personal qualifications may have gained such a distinction; all this, in the absence of information, must be left undetermined; one thing is certain, that the person who acted as president was not yet distinguished by any particular name.

The government of the church was the peculiar office of such overseers; it was their business to watch over the general order, to maintain the purity of the Christian doctrine and of Christian practice, to guard against abuses, to admonish the faulty, and to guide the public delib-

* I must here again (as before, p. 34,) declare myself in reference also to the first organization of the churches among the *Gentile* Christians, opposed to the view maintained by Kist and Baur, that originally small churches formed themselves under individual overseers, and that their form of government from the beginning was monarchical. According to Baur, the overseers as such in reference to their peculiar office, were "bishops," ἐπίσκοποι, and only when spoken of as united and forming a college, they were called "elders," πρεσβύτεροι. In Acts xiv. 23, we are told, that Paul appointed presbyters for the churches, formed in the different cities, that is, in each church a college of presbyters. To understand with Baur, that the plurality of presbyters is to be taken collectively, and for each church only one presbyter was appointed, would be inconsistent with Acts xx. 17, where it is said that Paul sent for the presbyters of the church at Ephesus, which implies that a plurality of presbyters presided over one church; or the word ἐκκλησία which in the passage first quoted is understood of a single church, must be here arbitrarily taken to signify several churches collectively—certainly quite contrary to the phraseology of the apostolic age, according to which the word ἐκκλησία signifies, either the whole Christian church, the total number of believers forming one body under one head, or a single church or Christian society. In that case, the plural τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν must necessarily have been used. Acts xx. 28 also implies that over each church a plurality of presbyters presided. And thus we must also explain Titus i. 5, which explanation (of the appointment of several presbyters in each city) is also generally favored by the language there used. I can discover no other difference between the "elders" and "bishops," in the apostolic age, than that the first notes the dignity, the second the duties of the office, whether the reference is to one or more.

† Perhaps an analogy may be found, in the fact (if it were so), that one among the Jewish presbyters was distinguished by the name of Archisynagogos; or the names "elders" and "rulers of the synagogue," (πρεσβύτεροι and ἀρχισυνάγωγοι) may bear the same relation to each other as "elders" and "bishops;" the first name denoting the rank, the second the nature of the office, ἀρχοντες τῆς συναγωγῆς.

erations; as appears from the passages in the New Testament where their functions are described. But their government by no means excluded the participation of the whole church in the management of their common concerns, as may be inferred from what we have already remarked in general respecting the nature of the Christian community, and as is also evident from many individual examples in the Apostolic church. The whole church at Jerusalem took part in the deliberations respecting the relation of the Jewish and Gentile Christians to each other, and the epistle drawn up after these deliberations was likewise in the name of the whole church. The Epistles of the Apostle Paul, which treat of various controverted ecclesiastical matters, are addressed to whole churches, and he assumes that the decision belonged to the whole body. Had it been otherwise, he would have addressed his instructions and advice, principally at least, to the overseers of the church. When a licentious person belonging to the church at Corinth was to be excommunicated, the apostle considered it a measure that ought to proceed from the whole society; and placed himself therefore in spirit among them, to unite with them in passing judgment; 1 Cor. v. 3—5. Also, when discoursing of the settlement of litigations, the apostle does not affirm that it properly belonged to the overseers of the church; for if this had been the prevalent custom, he would no doubt have referred to it; but what he says seems to imply that it was usual in particular instances to select arbitrators from among the members of the church; 1 Cor. vi. 5.

As to what relates to the edification of the church by the word, it follows from what we have before remarked, that this was not the exclusive concern of the overseer of the church; for each one had a right to express what affected his mind in the assembly of the brethren; hence many did not sufficiently distinguish between what was fit only for their own chamber, where every man might freely pour forth his heart before God, and what was suitable for communicating publicly,—an error censured by Paul, as we noticed in speaking of the gift of tongues.*

Only the female members of the church were excepted from this general permission. The fellowship of a higher life communicated by Christianity, extended itself to the relation between husband and wife; and the unity to which, according to its original destination, human nature aspires, was realized in this, as in every other respect, by Christianity. But since whatever is founded on the laws of nature is not injured by Christianity, but only animated afresh, sanctified, and refined; so also within this higher fellowship of life, which was to unite husband and

* It has been maintained, indeed, that this license in the apostolic church was extended only to those who appeared as prophets in the Christian assemblies; that from such a special case a general licence is not to be inferred, for these men as teachers armed with divine authority and speaking in God's name, might on that account be naturally excepted from common rules. See Mosheim's *Institut. Hist. Eccles. major.* sec. i. § 10 et. 18. But this objection is invalidated by what we have remarked respecting the charism of prophecy and its relation to other charisms.

wife, the latter retained her becoming place according to the natural destination of her sex. Mental receptivity and activity in family life were recognised in Christianity as corresponding to the destiny of woman, and hence the female sex are excluded from delivering public addresses on religious subjects in the meetings of the church;* 1 Cor. xiv. 34; 1 Tim. ii. 12.

Yet as by the participation of all in the conduct of church affairs, a regular government by appointed organs was not excluded, but both church and officers coöperated for the general good; so also together with that which the members of the church, by virtue of the common Christian inspiration, could contribute to their mutual edification, there existed a regular administration of instruction in the church, and an oversight of the transmission and development of doctrine which in this time of restlessness and ferment was exposed to so many adulterations, and for this purpose the "gifts of teaching" were designed. There were three orders of teachers in the apostolic age. The first place is occupied by those who were personally chosen and set apart by Christ, and formed by intercourse with him to be instruments for publishing the gospel among all mankind—the witnesses of his discourses, his works, his sufferings, and

* 1 Cor. xi. 5 appears to contradict this injunction, and in ancient times the Montanists thought—with whom several modern writers have agreed—that here an exception is to be found; as if the apostles intended to bind by no rule those cases in which the immediate operation of the Divine Spirit raised up prophets from the female sex; or as if he wished to debar females only from addresses that were peculiarly *didactic*, but not from the public expression of their feelings. But as to the first interpretation, it supposes too great a difference in respect to the divine element between the *διδάσκειν*—which must also proceed from an operation of the Holy Spirit—and the *προφητεύειν*. It must be certainly erroneous to suppose that any operation whatever of the Holy Spirit in the Christian church could be lawless. When the apostle Paul points out to the female that place in the church which is assigned her by the spirit of the gospel, which sanctifies nature, so also the Holy Spirit which is the Spirit of Christianity, follows everywhere this law of nature in his operations, and we cannot suppose that by an exception he would, in any way, remove woman from her natural position. Every deviation of this kind would appear as something morbid, and contrary to the spirit of the gospel.

Besides, when Paul gave that prohibition in reference to females, he was treating of addresses that were *not didactic*. This could, therefore, make no exception, whichever interpretation be applied. We must rather account for this apparent contradiction, by supposing that Paul, in the second passage, merely cited an instance of what occurred in the Corinthian church, and reserved his censures for another place. One of the reasons which Paul adduces in the passage quoted from the first Epistle to Timothy against the public speaking of females, is the greater danger of self-deception in the weaker sex, and the spread of errors arising from it—a reason which would apply with the greatest force to a class of addresses, in which sober reflectiveness was least of all in exercise. But this kind of religious utterance would be most suited to the female sex, where no danger of the sort alluded to, arising from publicity, would be connected with it—only it must be confined to the domestic circle. Hence the daughters of Philip, Acts xxi. 9, notwithstanding that rule, could act as prophetesses, unless we assume that this was an instance which Paul would have censured.

his resurrection—the Apostles,* among whom Paul was justly included, on account of Christ's personal appearance to him and the illumination of his mind independently of the instructions of the other apostles; next to these, were the Missionaries, or Evangelists, *εὐαγγελισταί*;† and lastly, the teachers appointed for separate churches, and taken out of their body, the *διδάσκαλοι*. If sometimes the “prophets,” *προφῆται*, are named next to the apostles and set before the evangelists and the “teachers,” *διδάσκαλοι*, such teachers must be meant in whom that inward condition of life, from which “prophesying” proceeded, was more constant, who were distinguished from other teachers by the extraordinary liveliness and steadiness of the Christian inspiration, and a peculiar originality of their Christian conceptions which were imparted to them by special “revelations,” *ἀποκαλύψεις*, of the Holy Spirit; and doubtless these prophets, as is evident from their position between the apostles and evangelists, belonged to the class of teachers who held no office in any one church, but travelled about to publish the gospel in a wider circle.

As regards the relation of the “teachers” to the “elders or bishops,” we obviously have no right to proceed on the supposition, that they always remained the same from the first establishment of Christian churches among the Gentiles, and therefore during the whole of Paul's ministry, a period so important for the development of the church; and hence we are not justified in concluding, from marks found in the latest Pauline Epistles, that the relation of these orders, as obtained from such marks, was the same as that which existed from the beginning in the Gentile churches. If we find several things in earlier documents which are at variance with these characteristics, the supposition must at least appear possible, that changes in the condition of the churches, and the experiences of the first period, had occasioned an alteration in this respect; and it is an utterly unfounded conclusion, if, because traces of such an altered relation are found in an epistle ascribed to

* This name in a general sense was applied to others who published divine truth in an extensive sphere of labor.

† This name does not imply that they occupied themselves with collecting and compiling narratives of the life of Christ; for the word *εὐαγγέλιον* originally denoted nothing else than the whole announcement of the salvation granted through Christ to men, and this announcement embraced the whole of Christianity. As this announcement rests on a historical basis, Christ as the Redeemer is the object of it; and thus the later-derived meaning is formed in which this word is specially applied to the histories of the Life of Christ. According to the original Christian phraseology, the term could only denote one whose calling it was to publish the doctrine of salvation to men, and thereby to lay a foundation for the Christian church; on the contrary, the “teacher,” *διδάσκαλος*, presupposed faith in the doctrine of salvation, and a church already founded, and employed himself in the further training in Christian knowledge. The use of the word *εὐαγγελιστής* in 2 Tim. iv. 5, favors this interpretation, and this original Christian phraseology was continued in later ages, although the more modern meaning of the word *εὐαγγέλιον* was connected with it.—*Euseb. Hist. Eccles.* iii. c. 37.

Paul, any one should infer that such an epistle could not have been written in the Pauline period. The first question then is, What was the original relation? If we proceed on the supposition, which is founded on the Pastoral Letters, that the *διδάσκαλοι* belonged to the overseers of the churches, two cases may be imagined; either that all the presbyters or bishops held also the office of teachers; or, that some among them, according to their peculiar talent (*χάρισμα*), were specially employed in the management of the outward guidance of the church (the *κυβέρνησις*), and others with the internal guidance of the word (the *διδασκαλία*); we shall thus have governing elders="pastors," and teaching elders="teachers," (*πρεσβύτεροι κυβερνῶντες=ποιμένες* and *πρεσβύτεροι διδάσκοντες=διδάσκαλοι*.) The first case certainly cannot be admitted, for the *χάρισμα* of *κυβέρνησις* is as decidedly distinct from the *χάρισμα* of *διδασκαλία*, as in common life the talent for governing and the talent for teaching are perfectly distinct from one another. And according to the original institution the peculiar office was to correspond to the peculiar charism. And, farther, since in the latter part of the Pauline period those presbyters who were equally capable of the office of teachers as well as governors, were especially commended, it is evident that this was not originally true of all. But neither have we sufficient reason for considering the second case, as noting the original relation of these several offices. Since the gifts of ruling or government (in the First Epistle to the Corinthians xii. 28, and in the Epistle to the Romans xii. 8), is so accurately distinguished from the talent of teaching,—and since these two characteristics, to rule and to govern or guide, evidently exhaust what belonged from the beginning to the office of presbyter or bishop, and for which it was originally instituted, we are not obliged to conclude that the *διδάσκαλοι* belonged to the class of overseers of the church.

In the Epistle written at a later period to the Ephesians (iv. 11), the "pastors" and "teachers," *ποιμένες* and *διδάσκαλοι*, are, it is true, placed together, in so far as they are both distinguished from those who presided over a more general sphere of labor, but only in that respect. Now the term *ποιμένες* denotes exactly the office of rulers of the church, the presbyters or bishops; it is not at all clear, therefore, that we should class the *διδάσκαλοι* with them. Otherwise the term *ποιμένες* might have been applied not improperly to *διδάσκαλοι*, the rather that in itself, and from the manner in which the image of a shepherd is used in the Old Testament and by Christ himself, it is fitted to denote the guidance of souls by the office of teaching. Farther, Paul classes *διδασχῆ* with those addresses which are not connected with holding a particular office (1 Cor. xiv. 26), but what every one in the church who had an inward call, and an ability for it, was justified in exercising.

It might also have happened, that in a church, after its presbytery had already been established, persons belonging to it came forward, or new

members were added, who, in consequence of their previous education, distinguished themselves in the office of teaching, even more than the existing presbyters, which would soon be evident from the addresses they delivered when the church assembled. At this season of the first free development of the Christian life, would the charism granted to such persons be neglected or repressed, merely because they did not belong to the class of presbyters? There were, as it appears, some members of the church in whose dwellings a portion of them used to assemble, and this depended probably not always on the convenient locality of their residence, but on their talent for teaching, which was thus rendered available; as Aquila, who though he resided sometimes at Rome, sometimes at Corinth, or at Ephesus, always wherever he took up his abode had a small congregation or church in his own house. (*ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ*.)*

Thus originally the office of overseer of the church probably had nothing in common with the work of instruction. Although the overseers of the church took cognisance not only of the good conduct of its members, but also of that which was considered as forming its basis, the maintenance of pure doctrine, and the exclusion of error; and though from the beginning care would be taken to appoint persons to this office who had attained to maturity and steadiness in their Christian principles, it does not follow that they possessed the gift of teaching, and in addition to their other labors occupied themselves in public addresses. It may be that at first, "teaching" was not generally connected with a distinct office, but that those who were fitted for it came forward in the public assemblies as

* The occurrence of such private churches is made use of by Kist and Baur as an argument for their opinion, that originally in the larger cities there were only insulated particular churches, under their own guiding presbyters, which were formed in various parts, and at a subsequent period were united into one whole. But the Epistles of the apostle Paul give the clearest evidence that all the Christians of one city originally formed one whole church. Yet we may easily suppose that some parts of the church, without separating themselves from the whole body and its guidance, held particular meetings in the house of some person whose locality was suitable, and who acted as the "teacher" for the edification of such small assemblies. Only thus can it be explained how Aquila and Priscilla, whether sojourning at Rome, or Corinth, or Ephesus, could have had such a small Christian society in their own house. To consider these as absolutely separate and distinct churches would be inconsistent; for we could not suppose that such a company of believers would be waiting for the arrival of a person like Aquila, who so often changed his residence; they must have had a fixed place of assembling, and their appointed overseers, a (presbyter or bishop, as the opinion may be.) In 1 Cor. xvi. 20, the church, forming one whole (all the brethren), is expressly distinguished from any such partial assembly. In Rom. xvi. 23, a brother is mentioned, in whose house the whole church held their meetings. In Coloss. iv. 15, after a salutation to the whole church, an individual is specified and included in the salutation, at whose house such private meetings were held. But it may be questioned whether in such places as Rom. xvi. 14, 15, ("Salute Asyncritus—and the brethren that are with them." "Salute Philologus—and all the saints that are with them,") meetings of this kind are intended, or only those persons who, on account of their family ties or connexions in business, lived in intimacy with one another.

“teachers;” until it naturally came to pass that those who were specially furnished with the “gifts of teaching,” of whom there would of course be only a few in most churches, were considered as those on whom the stated delivery of instruction devolved. In the Epistle to the Galatians (vi. 6), Paul, it is true, seems to intimate* that there were already teachers appointed by the church, who were to receive their maintenance from them. But the question arises, whether these words relate to the “teachers,” or to the itinerant “evangelists;” also, whether the passage speaks of some regular salary, or of the contributions of free love, by which the immediate wants of these missionaries were to be relieved. At all events,—which would also be confirmed by this latter passage, in case it is understood of “teachers,”—these were and continued to be generally distinct from the overseers of the church, although in particular cases the talents of teaching and governing might have been connected, and the presbyter have been equally able as a teacher.

Not until a later period, when the pure gospel had to contend with manifold errors, which threatened to corrupt it—as was especially the case during the latter period of Paul’s ministry;† not until this critical period was it thought necessary to unite more closely the offices of teachers and overseers, and to take care that overseers should be appointed, who would be able by their public instructions to protect the church from the infection of false doctrine, to establish others in purity of faith, and to convince the gainsayers; Tit. i. 9; and hence he esteemed those presbyters who labored likewise in the office of teaching, as deserving of special honor.

We have already remarked, that only females were excluded from the right of speaking in the public meetings of the church. But yet the gifts peculiar to their sex could be made available for the outward service of the church, in rendering assistance of various kinds, for which women are peculiarly fitted; and according to existing social habits, a deacon in many of his official employments would in reference to the female members of the church have excited suspicion; but it was desirable by

* Even after the reasons alleged by Schott against this interpretation, in his commentary on this Epistle, I cannot help considering it as the only natural one. And I cannot adopt the other, according to which the *πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς* is understood in a spiritual sense, (following the example of their teachers in all that is good.) I cannot suppose that Paul, if he had wished to admonish the Galatians to follow the example of their teachers in the Christian life, would have expressed himself in so obscure and spiritless a manner. As to the objection against the first interpretation, that it does not suit the connexion, I cannot admit its correctness. The exhortations to gentleness and humility in social intercourse, introduce the series of special exhortations, v. 26—vi. 6, where the *δὲ* marks the continued development, and a new exhortation follows, namely, that they should be ready to communicate of their earthly goods to their teachers; then verse 7, that they must not think of reaping the fruits of the gospel, if their conduct was not formed agreeably to it; if they with all their care directed only to earthly things, neglected such a duty towards those who labored for the salvation of their souls.

† See farther on.

all means to guard against any such imputation on the new religious sect, of which men were easily inclined to believe evil, because it was new and opposed to the popular faith. Hence the office of deaconess was instituted in addition to that of deacon, perhaps first in the churches of Gentile Christians. Of its institution and duties in the apostolic age we have no precise information, since we find it explicitly mentioned in only one passage of the New Testament; Rom. xvi. 1. In modern times, indeed, what Paul says in 1 Tim. v. 3-16, of the widows who received their maintenance from the church, has been applied to these deaconesses. And many qualifications which he requires of those who were to be admitted into the number of the widows (v. 10), and which appear to contain a reference to their special employments, as attention to strangers and the care of the poor, are in favor of the supposition. But since Paul only distinguishes them as persons supported by the church,* without mentioning any active service as devolving upon them; since he represents them as persons who, as suited their age and condition, were removed from all occupation with earthly concerns, and dedicated their few remaining days to devotion and prayer; and since, on the contrary, the office of deaconess certainly involved much active employment; we have no ground whatever for finding in this passage deaconesses, or females out of whose number deaconesses were chosen.† What Paul says in the passage quoted above of the deaconess of the church at Cenchrea, appears by no means to agree with what is said in the First Epistle to Timothy, concerning the age and destitute condition of widows. We must rather imagine such females to be among those widows who, after presenting a model in discharging their duties as Christian wives and mothers, would now obtain repose and a place of honor in the bosom of the church, where alone they could find a refuge in their loneliness; and by their devotional spiritual life set an edifying example to other females; perhaps, also, they might be able to communicate to such of their sex as sought their advice, the results of their Christian experience collected in the course of a long life, and make a favorable impression even on the Gentiles. Hence it would naturally be an occasion of scandal, if such persons quitted a life of retirement and devotion, and showed a fondness for habits that were inconsistent with their matronly character. At all

* I do not perceive how Baur can find any trace in the 5th chapter of the First Epistle to Timothy, that at that time the term *χήραι* was applied to the young unmarried females, in reference to their station in the church, which would be one of the marks of a later composition. The "widows indeed," *ὡτως χήραι*, in v. 5, are the truly destitute, who could find relief only in the church for their loneliness, contrasted with the widows mentioned in verse 4, who were supported by their own relations, instead of being a burden to the church. The "widow" — "desolate," *χήρα* — *μεμονωμένη*, verse 5, where the "and" is to be understood as *explicative*.

† The supposition, that in v. 9 mention is made of a different class of widows than those in v. 3, appears to me utterly untenable. A comparison of v. 16 with vs. 4 and 8, plainly shows that this whole section relates to the same subject.

events, we find here an ecclesiastical arrangement of later apostolic time, which is also indicated by other parts of the Epistle.

The consecration to offices in the church was conducted in the following manner. After those persons to whom its performance belonged, had laid their hands on the head of the candidate,—a symbolic action borrowed from the Jewish הַזָּכָה ,—they besought the Lord that he would grant, what this symbol denoted, the impartation of the gifts of his Spirit for carrying on the office thus undertaken in his name. If, as was presumed, the whole ceremony corresponded to its intent, and if the requisite disposition existed in those on whom it was performed, there was good reason for considering the communication of the spiritual gifts necessary for the office, as connected with this consecration performed in the name of Christ. And since Paul from this point of view designated the whole of the solemn proceeding, (without separating it into its various elements,) by that which was its external symbol (as in scriptural phraseology, a single act of a transaction consisting of several parts, and sometimes that most striking to the senses, is often mentioned for the whole); he required of Timothy that he should seek to revive afresh the spiritual gifts that he had received by the laying on of hands. 2 Ep. i. 6.

Respecting, farther, the election to offices in the church, it is evident that the first deacons, and the delegates who were authorized by the church to accompany the apostles, were chosen from the general body; 2 Cor. viii. 19. From these examples it might be concluded that a similar mode of proceeding was adopted at the appointment of presbyters. From the fact that Paul committed to his disciples Timothy and Titus (to whom he assigned the organization of new churches, or of such as had been injured by many corruptions) the appointment likewise of presbyters and deacons, and called their attention to the qualifications for such offices, we are by no means justified in concluding that they performed all this alone without the coöperation of the churches. The manner in which Paul was wont to address himself to the whole church, and to require the coöperation of the whole assembly, which must be apparent to every one in reading his Epistles,—leads us rather to expect, that where a church was already established, he would consult it as a party in their common concerns. Meanwhile it is possible, that the apostle himself in many cases, as on the founding of a new church, might think it advisable to propose the persons best fitted for such offices, and such a proposal would naturally carry the greatest weight with it. In the example of the family of Stephanas at Corinth, we see that those who first undertook office in the church, were members of the family first converted in that city. 1 Cor. xvi. 15.

It was also among the churches of the Gentile Christians that the peculiar nature of the Christian Worship was fully expressed in the character of their cultus. For among the Jewish Christians the ancient forms of the Jewish cultus were still retained, though persons of this class who were deeply imbued with the spirit of the gospel, and hence

had acquired the essence of inward spiritual worship, which is limited to no place or time,—were made free as it regarded their inward life from the thralldom of these forms, and had learned to refine them by viewing them in the light of the gospel. Such persons thought that the powers of the future world which they were conscious of having received, would still continue to operate in the forms belonging to the ancient economy, until that future world and the whole of its new heavenly economy would arrive, by means of the return of Christ to complete his kingdom,—a decisive era which appeared to them not far distant. On the contrary, among the Gentiles the free spiritual worship of God developed itself in direct opposition to Judaism, and the attempts to mingle Judaism and Christianity. According to the doctrine of the apostle Paul, the Mosaic law in its whole extent had lost its value as such to Christians; nothing could be a rule binding on Christians on account of its being contained in the Mosaic law; but, whatever was binding as a law for the Christian life, must as such derive its authority from another quarter. Hence a transference of the Old Testament command of the sanctity of the Sabbath to the Christian point of view was not admissible. Whoever considered himself subject to one such command, in Paul's judgment again placed himself under the yoke of the whole law; his inward life was thereby brought into servitude to outward earthly things, and sinking into Jewish nationalism he denied the universalism of the gospel; for by the principles of the gospel, the whole life should become in an equal manner related to God, and serve to glorify him, and thenceforth no opposition was to exist between what belonged to the world and what belonged to God. Thus all the days of the Christian life were to be equally holy to the Lord; hence Paul says to the Galatian Christians, who had allowed themselves to be so far led astray as to acknowledge the Mosaic law as binding, and to observe the Jewish feasts, "After that ye have known God, or rather (by his pitying love), have been led to the knowledge of God, how turn ye again* to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?"† Gal. iv. 9. He

* Thus he spoke to those who had formerly been heathen; for although in other points Judaism might be considered as opposed to heathenism, yet he viewed as an element common to both, the cleaving to outward forms.

† I have translated this passage according to the sense; more literally it would be,— "or rather are known by God, are become objects of his pity, are recognised as his." Living in estrangement from him, they lived in spiritual darkness, in ignorance of God and of divine things; but now by the mercy of God revealing itself to them, they obtained living communion with him, and the true knowledge of him. After Paul had contrasted their present attainment in divine knowledge with their former state of ignorance, he corrects himself, in order not to let it be imagined that they were indebted simply to the exercise of their own reason for this knowledge of God, and represents in strong terms, that they were indebted for every thing to divine grace, the grace of redemption. Therefore they were guilty of ingratitude in not making use of the knowledge vouchsafed to them by the grace of God. Had it been possible for Paul, according to the idiom of the Greek, to mark by a passive form of the same word *γινώσκειν*, the contrast between a

fears that his labors among them to make them Christians had been in vain, and for this very reason, that they reckoned the observance of certain days as holy to be an essential part of religion. The apostle does not here oppose the Christian feasts to the Jewish, but he considers this whole reference of religion to certain days as something foreign to the exalted position of Christian freedom, and belonging to that of Judaism and heathenism. With a similar polemical view (in Coloss. ii. 16) he declares his opposition to those who considered the observance of certain days as essential to religion, and who condemned such as did not observe them. Although, in the Epistle to the Romans, xiv. 1-6, he enjoins forbearance towards those in whom the Christian spirit was not yet developed with true freedom, yet he certainly considers it as the most genuine Christianity to think every day alike, to hold none as peculiarly sacred to the Lord; the *κρίνειν πᾶσαν ἡμέραν—μὴ φρονεῖν κυρίῳ τὴν ἡμέραν*.

It is worthy of notice, that Paul in such passages entirely rejects even festive observances, as they were considered among Gentiles and Jews as something absolutely essential to religion, and does not even mention any days which had been consecrated to religion in a freer method, and suited to Christianity, Christian feasts properly so called. So far was he from thinking that from the Christian point of view there could be days which could in any manner bear a resemblance to what in the Jewish sense was a feast, or that it was necessary to set apart any day whatever as specially to be observed by the church! From such passages we may conclude, that, in the Gentile churches, all days of the week were considered alike suitable for the service of the church; and that all preference of one day to another was regarded as quite foreign to the genius of the gospel.

A perfectly unquestionable and definite mention of the ecclesiastical observance of Sunday among the Gentile Christians we cannot find in the times of the Apostle Paul, but there are two passages which make its existence probable. If what Paul says, 1 Cor. xvi. 2, relates to collections which were made at the meetings of the church, it would be evident from this passage that at that time the Sunday was specially devoted to such meetings. But Paul, if we examine his language closely, says no more than this: that every one should lay by in his own house on the first day of the week, whatever he was able to save. This certainly might mean, that every one should bring with him the sum he had saved to the meeting of the church, that thus the individual contributions might be collected together, and be ready for Paul as soon as he came. But this would be making a gratuitous supposition, not at all required by the

knowledge imparted by God, and a knowledge gained by the exercise of the mental powers alone, he would for that purpose have used the passive form. This, indeed, the laws of the Greek language did not permit; but yet the passive form, according to his customary Hellenistic idiom, gave him an opportunity to mark the contrast which he had in his mind still more strongly.

connexion of the passage.* We may fairly understand the whole passage to mean, that every one on the first day of the week should lay aside what he could spare, so that when Paul came, every one might be prepared with the total of the sum thus laid by, and then, by putting the sums together, the collection of the whole church would be at once made. If we adopt this interpretation, we could not infer that special meetings of the church were held and collections made on Sundays. And if we assume that, independently of the influence of Christianity, the Jewish reckoning by weeks had been adopted among the heathen in the Roman Empire; still in this passage we can find no evidence for the existence of a religious distinction of Sunday. But since we are not authorized to make this assumption, unless a church consisted for the most part of those who had been Jewish Proselytes,† we shall be compelled to conclude that the religious observances of Sunday occasioned its being considered the first day of the week. It is also mentioned in Acts xx. 7, that the church at Troas assembled on a Sunday and celebrated the Lord's Supper. But here the question arises, whether Paul put off his departure from Troas to the next day, because he wished to celebrate the Sunday with this church—or whether the church met on the Sunday (though otherwise they might have met on any other day) because Paul had fixed to leave Troas on the following day.

At all events, we must derive the origin of the religious observance of Sunday, not from the Jewish-Christian churches, but from the peculiar circumstances of the Gentile Christians, and we may account for the practice in the following manner. Where the circumstances of the churches did not allow of daily meetings for devotion and agapæ—although in the nature of Christianity no necessity could exist for such a distinction, although on the Christian principle all days were to be considered as equally holy, in an equal manner devoted to the Lord—yet on account of these special outward circumstances, such a distinction of a particular day was adopted for religious communion. They rejected the Sabbath which the Jewish Christians celebrated, in order to avoid the risk of mingling Judaism and Christianity, and because another event associated more closely another day with their Christian feelings. For, since the sufferings and resurrection of Christ appeared as the central point of Christian knowledge and practice; since his resurrection was viewed as the foundation of all Christian joy and hope, it was natural that the day which was connected with the remembrance of this event, should be specially devoted to Christian communion.

But even if a weekly day was thus distinguished in the churches of Gentile Christians, still it is very doubtful if any yearly commemoration of the resurrection was observed among them. Some have found in 1 Cor. v. 7, a reference to a Christian passover which was to be celebrated

* The word *θησαυρίζων*, 1 Cor. xvi. 2, applied to setting aside the small sums weekly, is against the notion of a public collection.

† See Ideler's *Chronologia*, vol. I. p. 180.

in a Christian sense, and with reference to its Christian significance; but we can find a reference only to a Jewish passover, which was still celebrated by the Jewish Christians. When Paul was writing those words, the Jews and Jewish Christians were present to his imagination, as, on the fourteenth of Nisan, they carefully searched every corner of their houses, lest any morsel of leaven should have escaped their notice. This practice of outward Judaism he applies in a spiritualized sense to Christians. "Purify yourselves from the old leaven (the leaven of your old nature, which still cleaves to you from your old corruption), that you may become a new mass (that is, renewed and justified human nature), and as it were unleavened, (that is, purified by Christ from the leaven of sin, as elsewhere Paul represents purification from sin, the being dead to sin, as connected with the death of Christ)* for Christ has been offered as our paschal lamb; (they were ever to remember that true paschal lamb, by whose offering they were truly freed from sin; the Jewish paschal lamb was henceforth useless). Therefore, as men purified from sin by Christ our paschal lamb, let us celebrate the feast, not after the manner of the Jews, who swept the leaven out of their houses, but retained the leaven of old corruption in their hearts—but let us so celebrate it that we may be a mass purified in heart from the leaven of sin." In all this, there is evidently no reference to the celebration of a Christian passover among Gentile Christians, but only the contrast of the spiritual passover, comprehending the whole life of the redeemed, with the merely outward Jewish feast.†

The celebration of the two symbols of Christian communion, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, belonged to the unchangeable groundwork of the Christian church, laid by the Divine Founder Himself; these rites therefore were to be recognised equally by Jews and Gentiles, and no alteration could be made in them by the peculiar form of ecclesiastical life among the Gentiles; we need therefore to add little to what we have before remarked. In Baptism, entrance into communion with Christ appears to have been the essential point; thus persons were united to the spiritual body of Christ and received into the communion of the redeemed, the church of Christ; Gal. iii. 27; 1 Cor. xii. 13. Hence bap-

* This is no doubt the simplest interpretation of the words *καθὼς ἐστε ἄζυμοι*, "as ye are unleavened," purified as redeemed persons for ever from the "leaven of sin," *ζύμη τῆς ἁμαρτίας*. But if with Grotius we understand the words according to the analogy of the Greek *ἄσπιτος*, *ἄσπιτος*, "as ye eat no leaven," inasmuch "as ye celebrate the feast of unleavened bread, or the Passover," still this can be understood only of a spiritual passover; for otherwise it would not agree with that which is afterwards adduced as a reason, and it would also be implied that the Gentile Christians had refrained from leavened bread at Easter, which Paul, on his principles, could not have allowed.

† If we supposed that these words related to an Easter-feast, celebrated among the Gentile Christians, it would follow that they celebrated this feast at the same time as the Jews, and then it would hardly be possible to explain the rise of the disputes relative to the time of observing Easter.

tism, according to its characteristic mark, was designated a baptism into Christ, into the name of Christ, as the acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messiah was the original article of faith in the apostolic church; and this was probably the most ancient* formula of baptism; which was still made use of even in the third century (see my Church History, vol. i. p. 546). The usual form of submersion at baptism, practised by the Jews, was passed over to the Gentile Christians. Indeed, this form was the most suitable to signify that which Christ intended to render an object of contemplation by such a symbol; the immersion of the whole man in the spirit of a new life. But Paul availed himself also of what was accidental to the form of this symbol, the two-fold act of submersion and of emersion, to which Christ certainly made no reference at the institution of the symbol. As he found therein a reference to Christ Dead, and Christ Risen, the negative and positive aspect of the Christian life—in imitation of Christ dying to all ungodliness, and in communion with him rising to a new divine life,—so in the transmitted form of baptism, he made use of what was thus accidental to represent, by a sensible image, the idea and design of the rite in its connexion with the whole nature of Christianity.†

Since baptism marked the entrance into communion with Christ, it resulted from the nature of the rite, that a confession of faith in Jesus as the Redeemer would be made by the person to be baptized; and in the latter part of the apostolic age, there are found indications of the existence of such a practice.‡ As baptism was closely united with a con-

* In the Shepherd of Hermas (lib. I. visio iii. c. 7), in Fabricii Cod. apocr. Nov. Test. p. 804, it is said, I have baptized in the name of the Lord, *baptizavi in nomine Domini*.

† Everything pertaining to the more exact development of the dogmatic idea, we reserve for the section on doctrines.

‡ These indications are such as will not amount to incontrovertible certainty. We find the least doubtful reference in 1 Pet. iii. 21, but the interpretation of this passage has been much disputed. If the words are understood in this sense, "a question as to a good conscience in reference to God, through the resurrection of Christ," a question proposed at baptism might be inferred from it, of which the purport would be, whether a person believed in the resurrection of Christ, as a pledge of the forgiveness of sins granted to him, and hence would think of God in this faith with a good conscience. But Winer could against such an interpretation of the passage justly object, that in this case, the answer given by the candidate as an expression of his confession, of his faith which peculiarly related to salvation, rather than the question, must have been mentioned. Yet Winer's explanation (in his Grammar) in reference to the word *ἐπερώτημα*,—the seeking of a good conscience after God,—although *ἐπερωτᾶν εἰς* in the Hellenistic idiom, as the passage adduced by Winer shows, may have this meaning—does not appear the most natural. If Peter had wished to say this, would he not have preferred using the form *ἐπερώτησις*? And may it not be said against this interpretation, that the apostle would have mentioned as that which saved at baptism, not so much the seeking after God, as the finding God through Christ, the attainment of communion with him, according to the analogy of scriptural representations on this subject?

But what Peter wished particularly to point out, was the spiritual character of the whole baptismal rite, in opposition to a mere outward sensible purification. This spiritual

scious entrance on Christian communion, faith and baptism were always connected with one another; and thus it is in the highest degree probable that baptism was performed only in the instances where both could meet together, and that the practice of infant baptism was unknown at this period. We cannot infer the existence of infant baptism from the instance of the baptism of whole families, for the passage in 1 Cor. xvi. 15, shows the fallacy of such a conclusion, as from that it appears that the whole family of Stephanas, who were baptized by Paul, consisted of adults. That not till so late a period as (at least *certainly* not earlier than) Irenæus, a trace of infant baptism appears, and that it first became recognised as an apostolic tradition in the course of the third century, is evidence rather *against* than *for* the admission of its apostolic origin; especially since, in the spirit of the age when Christianity appeared, there were many elements which must have been favorable to the introduction of infant baptism,—the same elements from which proceeded the notion of the magical effects of outward baptism, the notion of its absolute necessity for salvation, the notion which gave rise to the myth that the apostles baptized the Old Testament saints in Hades.* How very much must infant baptism have corresponded with such a tendency, if it had been favored by tradition! It might indeed be alleged, on the other hand, that after infant baptism had long been recognised as an apostolic tradition, many other causes hindered its universal introduction, and the same causes might still earlier have stood in the way of its spread, although a practice sanctioned by the apostles. But these causes *could not have operated in this manner in the post-apostolic age*. In later times, we see the opposition between theory and practice, in this respect, actually coming forth. Besides, that a practice which could not altogether deny the marks of its later institution, although at last recognized as of apostolic founding, could not for a length of time pervade the life of the church, is something quite different from this: that a practice really proceeding from apostolic institution and tradition, notwithstanding the authority that introduced it, and the circumstances in its favor arising from the spirit of the times, should yet not have been generally adopted. And if we wish to ascertain from whom such an institution originated, we should say, certainly not immediately from Christ

character could certainly be pointed out by the question proposed at baptism, which referred to the spiritual, religious object of the rite; and the question is alluded to instead of the answer, because it precedes and is that which gives occasion to the answer, and thus the first interpretation may be justified.

The second trace of such a baptismal confession is found in 1 Tim. vi. 12, but it is not quite evident that a confession of this kind is intended; it might be only one which Timothy had given from the free impulse of feeling, when he was set apart to be the associate of Paul in publishing the gospel.

* See *the Shepherd of Hermas*, iii. ch. 15. Fabricii cod. Apocryp. p. iii. p 1009. lib. iii. simil. ix. p. 428, ed. Hefele. Tüb. 1847. *κατέβησαν οὖν μετ' αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ πάλιν ἀνέβησαν*.

himself. Was it then from the primitive church in Palestine, from an injunction given by the earlier apostles? But among the Jewish Christians, circumcision was held as a seal of the covenant, and hence they had so much less occasion to make use of another dedication for their children. Could it then have been Paul, who first among heathen Christians introduced this alteration by the use of baptism. But this would agree least of all with the peculiar Christian characteristics of this apostle. He who says of himself that Christ sent him not to baptize, but to preach the gospel; he who always kept his eye fixed on one thing, justification by faith, and so carefully avoided every thing which could give a handle or support to the notion of a justification by outward things (the *σαρκικά*)—how could he have set up infant baptism against the circumcision that continued to be practised by the Jewish Christians? In this case, the dispute carried on with the Judaizing party, on the necessity of circumcision, would easily have given an opportunity of introducing the subject of infant baptism into the controversy, if it had really existed. The evidence arising from silence on this topic, has therefore the greater weight.

Even if in 1 Cor. xv. 29 a substitutionary baptism for the dead is intended,* as indeed appears to be the most natural interpretation, yet this could not be made use of, by way of analogy, to support the existence of infant baptism. For if the interpretation alluded to be correct, yet we cannot understand it, as if the Christians imagined that their deceased relatives who died in unbelief could be benefited by a substitutionary baptism; for according to this supposition, Christians need not care so much for converting the living as for baptizing [or baptizing for] the dead. And certainly Paul would not have used, even as a mere *argumentum ad hominem*, a superstition carried so far beyond all bounds. He could not even have mentioned a superstition productive of such a distortion of Christianity without strong expressions of his disapproba-

* Independent of this Pauline passage there is no trace to be found anywhere of such a substitutionary baptism. The testimony of Tertullian has been erroneously cited. He refers, *De resurrectione carnis*, c. 48, only to what he believed Paul to say in these words. In his work against Marcion, v. 10, he also refers merely to that passage, and it seems to him that in such substitutionary baptism there is something similar to the heathen purgations for the dead, which took place on the 1st of February, the *Februationes*. He thought it important to remark, that Paul could not have approved of such a practice. "Viderit institutio ista. Kalendæ si forte Februaris respondebunt illi pro mortuis petere. Noli ergo apostolum novum statim auctorem aut confirmatorem ejus denotare, ut tanto magis sisteret carnis resurrectionem, quanto illi qui vane pro mortuis baptizarentur, fide resurrectionis hoc facerent." "Let this rite take care of itself; the Kalendæ Februaris, perchance, will answer to that praying for the dead. Do not, therefore, at once designate the apostle as a voucher or confirmer of the doctrine which would establish the resurrection of the body on the fact that an unauthorized baptism for the dead was performed in the faith of a resurrection.) And he himself afterwards proposes another interpretation of the passage, according to which there is no allusion to a substitutionary baptism. Later uneducated Marcionites in Syria had, most probably from this passage of St. Paul's, adopted a practice altogether at variance with the spirit of Marcion.

tion. We must rather form some such conception as the following of the state of the case. It seems that at that time, in Corinth, an epidemic had been raging which in many instances had terminated fatally. When those who had already believed were taken away by death before they could receive baptism, as they otherwise would have done, their relations were baptized in their stead, since they knew that they could themselves submit to baptism, and express Christian conviction in the name, and according to the intention of the deceased. But then, faith, as the necessary condition of baptism, was presupposed to exist in those persons in whose stead they allowed themselves to be baptized. Paul would then, it is true, have borrowed for the occasion an argument from the faith lying at the basis of such a custom; but he would probably have taken care to declare himself, at another opportunity, opposed to the custom itself, as he did in reference to females speaking in their public assemblies.

If the alteration in the conception of baptism by the confounding of baptism and regeneration, had already at an early period spread so widely, we should so much the more expect the early introduction of infant baptism as the natural consequence of such an alteration. If this, however, were not the case, we might well conclude that other powerful causes counteracted the influence of such a change of view—one, some other important truth in the conception of baptism derived from Apostolic times, another, the not yet suppressed consciousness of the non-apostolic institution of infant baptism.

We find, indeed, in one passage of Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 14, a trace, that already the children of Christians were distinguished from the children of heathens, and considered in a certain sense as belonging to the church; but this is not derived from their having partaken of baptism, and the manner in which it came to pass is rather evidence against the existence of infant baptism. The apostle is treating of the sanctifying influence of the communion between parents and children, by which the children of Christian parents would be distinguished from the children of those who were not Christian, and in virtue of which they might in a certain sense be termed “holy,” *ἁγία*, in contrast with the “unclean,” *ἀκάθαρα*.* But if infant baptism had been then in existence, the epithet “holy,” applied to Christian children, would have been deduced only from this sacred rite by which they had become incorporated with the Christian church. But in the point of view here taken by Paul, we find (although it testifies against the existence at that time of infant baptism) the fun-

* The immediate impressions—which proceed from the whole of the intercourse of life, and by means of the natural feeling of dependence of children on their parents, pass from the latter to the former—have a far stronger hold than the effects of instruction, and such impressions may begin before the ability for receiving instruction in a direct manner exists. These impressions attach themselves to the first germs of consciousness, and on that account, the commencement of this sanctifying influence cannot be precisely determined. See De Wette's excellent remarks in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1839. Part iii. p. 671.

damental idea from which the practice was afterwards necessarily developed, and by which it must be justified to agree with Paul's sentiments: an intimation of the preëminence belonging to children born in a Christian community; of the consecration for the kingdom of God thereby granted to them; and of an immediate sanctifying influence which would communicate itself to their earliest development.*

As to the celebration of the Holy Supper, it continued to be connected with the common meal, in which all as members of one family joined, as in the primitive Jewish church, and agreeably to its first institution. In giving a history of the Corinthian church, we shall have occasion to speak of the abuses which arose from the mixture of ancient Grecian customs with this Christian festival.

It is true the publication of the gospel among the heathen, was destitute of those facilities for its reception, which the long-continued expectation of a Redeemer as the promised Messiah gave it among the Jews. Here was no continuous succession of witnesses of the living, self-manifesting God, by whom the gospel might be indicated and foretold as it had been by the law and prophets among the Jews. Still the annunciation of a Redeemer found its point of connexion in the universal feeling adhering to the very essence of human nature—the feeling of disunion and guilt, and as a consequence of this, though not apprehended with distinctness, a longing after redemption from such a condition; and by the mental development of these nations, and their political condition at that period, sentiments of this kind were more vividly felt, while the feeling of disunion (in man's own powers, and between man and God) was manifested in the prevailing tendency towards dualistic views. The youthful confidence of the old world was constantly giving way to a feeling of disunion and sadness excited by the awakening sense of the law written on the heart, which, like the external law given to the Jews, was destined to guide the Gentiles to the Saviour. The gospel could not here as in its relation to Judaism be proclaimed, as the completion of what already existed in the popular religion; it must come forth as the antagonist of what already existed, of the heathenish deification of

* The words in 1 Cor. vii. 14, may be taken in a twofold manner. If we understand with De Wette, the "you," *ὑμῶν*, as applied to *all* Christians—(which the connexion and the use of the plural render probable)—then the apostle infers that the children of Christians, although not incorporated with the church, nor yet baptized, might be called "holy," (which is De Wette's opinion), and thus what we have remarked in the text follows as a necessary consequence. But if we admit that Paul is speaking of the case of married persons, in which one party was a Christian, and the other a heathen, and that from the sanctification of the children of such a marriage he infers the sanctification of the whole marriage relation—which thought more nearly suits the connexion—then it would appear that Paul deduces a sanctification of the children by their connexion with the parents, but not from their baptism, for the baptism of children, in cases of a mixed marriage, could, in many instances, be hardly performed. If infant baptism had at that time been in existence, he could not have called the children of such a mixed marriage "holy," in the same sense as the baptized children of Christian parents.

nature, and could only attach itself to the truth lying at the foundation of this enormity, the sense, namely, in the human breast of a hidden, unknown God ; it was necessary to announce Christianity as the revelation of that God, in whom, indeed, by virtue of their divine origin, men "lived and moved and had their being," but of whom, in consequence of their estrangement from him by sin, they had only a mysterious sense as an unknown and distant Divinity. Under this aspect it might be represented as a completion of that which was implanted by God in the original constitution of man, as the final aim of this indistinct longing. The progressive development of the religious consciousness in heathenism, offers to a discerning mind many adjustments for Christianity. But it was far from the views of Paul and of the early proclaimers of the gospel generally, to look for these ; and it would have been of no advantage in immediately operating on the hearts of the heathen. Also, in relation to all that was *truly natural*, belonging to the *original nature* of man, and not founded in sin, it might be truly asserted that Christ came not to destroy but to fulfil. And here certainly the Gentiles were placed in a more advantageous position than the Jews ; they were not exposed to the temptation of contemplating Christianity only as the completion of a religious system already in existence, and of disowning its purpose of producing an entire transformation of the life ; for to a convert from heathenism, Christianity presenting itself in direct opposition to all his former religious views and feelings, must necessarily appear as something altogether new and designed to effect an entire revolution in his life. Meanwhile, although Christianity must have at first presented itself as opposed to the existing elements of life in heathenism ; yet Christians who continued to live in intercourse with heathens under their old relations, were the more exposed, practically, to the infection of a corrupt state of morals, till their Christian life became firmly established. And although the peculiar position of the Gentiles did not expose them so much as the Jews to pervert faith itself into an *opus operatum*, and thus to misuse it as a cloak for immorality, still such an error might easily arise, if not from the influence of Judaizing teachers, yet from the depraved condition of human nature itself. It is evident that Paul deemed it necessary emphatically to guard and warn them against it.*

Another danger of a different kind threatened Christianity when it found its way among the educated classes in the seats of Grecian learning. Since in these places the love of knowledge predominated, and overruled all the other fundamental tendencies of human nature ; since men were disposed to cultivate intellectual eminence to the neglect of morals, and since Christianity gave a far wider scope than Heathenism to the exercise of the mental powers ; since in many respects it agreed with those among the Grecian philosophers, who rested their opposition to the

* The "vain words," *κενοὶ λόγοι*, against which Paul warns the Ephesians (v. 6.)

popular religions on an ethical basis ; it consequently happened, that they made Christianity, contrary to its nature and design, chiefly an exercise of the understanding, and aimed to convert it into a philosophy, thus subordinating the practical interest to the theoretical, and obscuring the real genius of the gospel. The history of the further spread of Christianity among the heathen, and of individual churches founded among them, will give us an opportunity of developing this fact, and setting it in a clearer light. We now proceed to the second missionary journey of the apostle Paul.

CHAPTER VI.

THE SECOND MISSIONARY JOURNEY OF THE APOSTLE PAUL.

AFTER Paul and Barnabas had spent some time with the church at Antioch, they resolved to revisit the churches founded in the course of their former missionary journey, and then to extend their labors still further. Barnabas wished to take his nephew Mark again with them as a companion, but Paul refused his assent to this proposal, for he could not excuse his having allowed attachment to home to render him unfaithful to the Lord's service, and deemed one who was not ready to sacrifice every thing to this cause as unfitted for such a vocation. We see on this occasion the severe earnestness of Paul's character, which gave up, and wished others to give up, all personal considerations and feelings where the cause of God was concerned ; just as he never allowed himself to be tempted or seduced even by his natural attachment to the nation to whom he belonged.* The indulgence shown by Barnabas to Mark might proceed either from the peculiar mildness of his Christian character, or from a regard to the ties of relationship not yet sufficiently controlled by the power of the Christian spirit. That such human attachments had still too much influence on Barnabas, is shown by his conduct at Antioch on the occasion of the conference between Peter and Paul.† Thus a sudden difference arose between two men who had hitherto labored together in the work of the Lord, which ended in their separation from one another, and thus it was shown, not only that these men of God were not free from human weakness, but also that even this contributed to the extension of the kingdom of God ; for, in consequence of it, the circle of their

* In the "first," *πρῶτον*, of Rom. i. 16, we cannot, with Rückert, find marks of this national attachment not entirely overcome. This *πρῶτον* corresponds with the necessary historical development of the Theocracy. The supposition is also excluded by the application of *πρῶτον* in Rom. ii. 9.

† See farther on.

labors was very greatly enlarged ; Barnabas now formed a sphere of action for himself, and first of all visited with Mark his native country Cyprus, and then most probably devoted himself to preach the gospel in other regions. For, that he remained in his native country unemployed in missionary service, not only his labors up to this time forbid our supposing, but also the terms in which Paul speaks of him at a later period (1 Cor. ix. 6) as a well-known and indefatigable preacher of the gospel. Paul's severity towards Mark was probably of service in leading him to a sense of his misconduct, for he afterwards continued faithful to his vocation. This separation was in the issue only temporary, for we afterwards find Barnabas, Paul, and Mark, in close connexion with one another, although Barnabas appears always to have retained a separate, independent sphere of action. In his stead Paul took Silas as his fellow-laborer.

From the beginning of his ministry, it was a fixed principle with Paul, as he himself tells us in Rom. xv. 20, and 2 Cor. x. 16, to form his own field of labor for the propagation of the gospel, and not to trespass on that of any other person ; instead, therefore, of betaking himself first to Cyprus, as on former occasions, he travelled through the neighboring parts of Syria to Cilicia, Pisidia, and the towns in which he had labored on his first journey. In the town of Lystra * he found a young man named Timothy, who, by the instructions of his mother, a pious Jewess, but married to a heathen, had received religious impressions which had an abiding effect. His mother was converted when Paul first visited that town, and young Timothy also became a zealous confessor of the gospel. The report of his Christian zeal had spread to the neighboring town of Iconium. In the church to which he belonged, the voices of prophets

* I must here differ from the opinion I expressed in the first edition. In Acts xvi. 1, the "there," *ἐκεῖ*, if there are no reasons for the contrary, is most naturally understood of the place last mentioned, Lystra ; and since the favorable testimony to his character given by the brethren at Lystra and Iconium is mentioned, though it is barely possible that the testimony of persons living in the nearest towns to his own might have been adduced, yet we may presume, with some confidence, that one of these towns was his native place ; for it is not probable that what those who knew him best said of him would have been passed over. In Acts xx. 4, the approved reading is rather for, than against this supposition ; for if Timothy had been a native of Derbe, the predicate *Δερβαιοῦ* would not have been applied to Γάιος alone, but Luke would have written *Δερβαίων δὲ Γάιος καὶ Τιμόθεος* or *Γάιος καὶ Τιμόθεος Δερβαιοί*. But it is surprising that, in this passage, Timothy stands alone without the mention of his native place, and that in Acts xix. 29, Aristarchus and Gaius are named together as Macedonians and companions of Paul. Hence it might be presumed that the predicate *Δερβαίος* had been misplaced, and ought to stand with Timothy's name. Aristarchus, Secundus and Gaius would then be named as natives of Thessalonica, and Timothy of Derbe. But if we adopt this view, then Acts xvi. 1, 2, must be differently explained. But still it is not probable that the more easy reading could be altogether removed to make way for one more difficult. So common a name as Gaius might easily belong to a Christian at Derbe and to another from Macedonia, as we find it borne also by an approved Christian residing at Corinth, Rom. xvi. 23, 1 Cor. i. 14 ; and Timothy's native place might have been omitted because he was the best known of all Paul's associates.

announced that he was destined to be a distinguished agent in spreading the gospel.

It was agreeable to Paul to have a zealous youth with him, who could assist him on his missionary journeys, and be trained for a preacher under his direction. He seconded the voices that thus called on Timothy, and the young man himself was prepared by his love to their common Lord to accompany his faithful servant every where. As by his descent and education he belonged on one side to the Jews, and on the other to the Gentiles, he was the more fitted to be the companion of the apostle among both. And in order to bring him nearer the former, Paul caused him to be circumcised, by which he yielded none of the publicly acknowledged rights of the Gentile Christians; for being the son of a Jewess, and educated in Judaism, he could with more propriety be claimed by the Jews.

It has been asserted by Dr. Baur, that such conduct would have been a contradiction of Paul's principles, and therefore that this account is unhistorical, and that the fabrication owes its origin to the conciliatory aims of the author of the Acts. But we can see no proofs whatever of this contradiction. The same Paul who so strenuously opposed the circumcising of Titus, because it would have seemed a practical confirmation of the principle that a participation in all the privileges of the kingdom of God depended on circumcision—this same Paul could yet allow Timothy, the son of a Jewess, and brought up in Judaism, to be circumcised, in order thereby to procure an easier entrance for him among the Jews; and as here circumcision was founded on descent, it could not be made use of to justify a dogmatic conclusion, as might have been the case with the circumcision of a Gentile.* And as regards generally the conduct which is often ascribed to Paul in the Acts—that among the Jews he observed Jewish practices, and lived altogether as a Jew; we believe in this respect, as well as in others, it can be shown that what the apostle himself asserts in his Epistles concerning his mode of acting, leads us to look for such examples of conduct as are recorded in the Acts. What are we to understand, when Paul says in 1 Cor. ix. 20, that 'to the Jews he became a Jew in order to gain the Jews, to them that are under the law, as under the law, that he might gain them that are under the law?' Must we not from such words conclude, that he, without prejudice to his inward freedom from the Law, believed that in the outward observance of it he could place himself on a level with the Jews—that he felt himself compelled so to act in order to pave the way more easily to the hearts of the Jews, whom he wished to gain over to the gospel? Are they not exactly such acts as gave his Jewish adversaries

* The expression used in the Acts itself (xvi. 3) is not at all what it would be, had the design been to set Paul in a favorable light to the religious prejudices of Jewish Christians. There is expressly designated only an *outward* accommodation to the Jewish point of view. Surely such a design would have manifested itself in quite a different way.

the opportunity to set his conduct in a false light before the Gentiles, and to accuse him of inconsistency? Certainly, from what we find in the Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians, we shall be obliged to assume that he acted exactly as we are told was the case in the Acts of the Apostles. We make these remarks here once for all, in order not to return again to this ground of suspicion against the Acts.

After Paul had visited the churches already founded in this district, he proceeded to Phrygia. Of course he could not, either on this or on a later journey, publish the gospel in all the threescore and two* towns of the populous province of Phrygia. He must have left much to be accomplished by his pupils, such, for instance, as Epaphras at Colossæ, who afterwards founded a church there and in the towns of Hierapolis and Laodicea.† Thence he directed his course northward to Galatia. As

* This is the number stated in the sixth century by Hierocles, author of the *Συνέκδημος*, or a "Traveller's Companion," which gives an account of the provinces and towns of the Eastern Empire.

† I cannot agree with the opinion of Dr. Schulz, brought forward in the *Studien und Kritiken*, vol. ii. part 3, which is also advocated by Dr. Schott in his *Isagoge*, that Paul himself was the founder of these churches. I cannot persuade myself that, if the Colossians and Laodiceans had received the gospel from the lips of the apostle, he would have placed them in the same category, without any distinction, with those who were not personally known to him, as we find in Coloss. ii. 1; since, in reference to his anxiety for the churches, it certainly made an important difference whether he himself had founded them or not. The "as many," *οσοι* would have been used too indefinitely, if its meaning had not been fixed by what preceded; from which it appears, that those churches of Phrygia are referred to, which, like the churches at Colossæ and Laodicea, had not been founded by Paul himself. And how can it be supposed that, in an epistle to a church founded by himself, he would never appeal to what they had heard from his own lips, but only to the announcement of the gospel which they had heard from others? and that he should speak not of what he himself had seen and heard among them, but only of what had been reported to him by others respecting their state? The concise, elegant and acute remarks of Prof. Wiggers, in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1838, part i. p. 171, have not induced me to alter my opinion on this point. The explanation he gives of the words in Coloss. ii. 1, "also for those (among the Christians in Colossæ and Laodicea) who have not known me personally," appears to me not so natural as the common one, which I follow. If Paul had intended to say this, he would hardly have failed to limit "as many," *οσοι*, by adding "of you," *υμων*. If the "also," *καὶ*, in 1, 7 is also to be retained, yet I do not find any intimation conveyed by it that they had received instruction from another teacher, but only that they had received from Epaphras the same gospel of the divine grace which had been published throughout the world. But, from external evidence, I cannot help considering the *καὶ* as suspicious; especially since the frequent repetition of it in what precedes, and the observable reference to v. 6, might easily occasion the insertion of it. But if the *καὶ* is spurious, it appears much more clearly that Epaphras, not Paul, was the teacher of this church. He is called a servant of Christ in Paul's stead (*υπερ ημων διακονος*), because Paul had given over to him the office of proclaiming the gospel in the three cities of Phrygia which he himself could not visit. It is not clear to me that Paul, in ii. 5, could not have used the word *ἀπειμι* to denote his bodily absence in opposition to his spiritual presence among them, although he did not mean that he had been once among them, and was now removed to a distance from them. It still appears to me remarkable, that—if he wrote some years after his presence among them—there should be

many Jews resided in this province, he addressed himself probably first to these, and to the proselytes who worshipped with them in the synagogues. But the ill-treatment he met with among the Jews prepared an opening for him to the Gentiles, by whom he was received with great affection.

Paul had to maintain a severe conflict with bodily suffering, as appears from many allusions in his epistles, where he speaks of his being given up to a sense of human weakness. Nor is this surprising, for as a Pharisee, striving after the righteousness of the law, he had certainly not spared his own body. After he had found salvation by faith in the Redeemer, and had attained the freedom of the evangelical spirit, he was, it is true, very far from a tormenting castigation of his body, and from legal dependence on works; he expresses the most decided opposition to everything of the kind, in words which exhibit a spirit which, while it was independent of all outward circumstances and things, yet freely subordinated and appropriated all that was external, to a higher object. Such are those memorable words which testify such consciousness of true freedom: "I know both how to be abased, and I know how to abound, everywhere and in all things; I am instructed both to be full and to be hungry, both to abound and to suffer need. I can do all things through Christ that strengtheneth me." Phil. iv. 12, 13. But his new vocation allowed him still less to spare himself, since he labored hard with his own hands for a livelihood, at the same time that he exerted his powers both of mind and body to the utmost in his apostolic ministry; since also he had so many dangers to undergo, so many hardships and sufferings to endure, under which a weak body might soon sink. Yet with the sense of human weakness, the consciousness waxed stronger of a might surpassing all human power, a divine all-conquering energy which proved its efficiency in his proclamation of the gospel and in his call to the work; and he could perfectly distinguish this divine power from all merely human endowments. Under a sense of human weakness he became raised above himself, by that inward glory which beamed upon him in those communications of a higher world with which he was honored. He considered a peculiarly oppressive pain which constantly attended him,† and checked the soaring of his exalted

no allusion to his personal intercourse with them, especially in an epistle to a church which was in so critical a state; to whom it was so important to evince his love and care for them, and to exhort faithfully to keep the instructions they had received from him; also, if it concerned him to commend Epaphras to them as the person who was to carry on the work which he had begun, he would so much the more have stated explicitly, that Epaphras taught no other doctrine than that which they had at first received from himself, that he would only raise the superstructure on the foundation laid by himself.

† I cannot agree with those who think that Paul, in 2 Cor. xii. 7, where he alludes to something that constantly tormented him like a piercing thorn which a person carries about in his body, only intended to signify his numerous opponents. Certainly we cannot be justified in saying, that Paul meant nothing else than what he mentions in the 10th

spirit, as an admonition to humility given him by God, as a counterpoise to those moments of inward glorification which were vouchsafed him. And he informs us, that after he had prayed thrice to the Lord, to free him from this oppressive pain, an answer by a divine voice, either in vision or in pure inward consciousness, was granted him, that he must not desire to be freed from that which deepened the sense of his human weakness, but must be satisfied with the consciousness of the divine grace imparted to him; for the power of God proved itself to be truly such, even in the midst of human weakness.

He experienced the truth of this, especially during his ministry in Galatia. His body was bowed down through debility, but the divine power of his words and works, in such striking contrast with the feebleness of the material organ, made a powerful impression on susceptible dispositions. The glowing zeal of self-sacrificing love which amidst his own sufferings enabled him to bear everything so joyfully for the salvation of others, must have attracted the hearts of his hearers with the greater force, and excited that ardent attachment to his person which he so vividly describes in Gal. iv. 14. "Ye received me as an angel of God, even as Jesus Christ."

The Galatian churches were formed of a stock of native Gentiles; partly, of a great number of Proselytes, for whom Judaism had become the transition-point to Christianity, and partly, of persons who had passed immediately from heathenism to Christianity; and with this Gentile stock of the church, some Jews also connected themselves, who were distinguished from the great mass of their unbelieving countrymen by their susceptibility for the gospel. But by former Proselytes and the Jewish Christians in the churches, an intercourse with the Jews was kept up, and hence arose those disturbances of which we shall presently speak.

On leaving Galatia, Paul was at first uncertain in what direction to turn, since new fields of labor opened to him on different sides. At one time, he thought of going in a south-westerly direction, to Proconsular Asia, and afterwards of passing in a northerly direction to Mysia and Bithynia; but either by an inward voice or by a vision he received a monition from the Divine Spirit, which caused him to abandon both these plans. Having formed an intention of passing over to Europe, but wait-

verse; for in this latter passage, he only applies the general truth—which the divine voice had assured him of in reference to the particular object before mentioned—to everything which might contribute to render him sensible of his human weakness. This application of the principle, and the peculiar phraseology of Paul, lead us to suppose that he meant to indicate something purely specific in the first passage. We cannot indeed suppose that he would pray to be delivered from such sufferings as were essentially and indissolubly connected with his vocation. But we must conclude that his prayers referred to something altogether personal, which affected him not as an apostle, but as Paul; though it would be absurd, in the total absence of all distinguishing marks, to attempt to determine exactly what it was.

ing to see whether he should be withheld or encouraged by a higher guidance, he betook himself to Troas; and a nocturnal vision, in which a Macedonian appeared calling in behalf of his nation for his aid, confirmed his resolution to visit Macedonia. If we admit that Luke* speaks in his own name in Acts xvi. 10, it would follow that Paul first met with him again at Troas, and received him into the company of his missionary associates. His medical skill might have been very useful to gain an opening for publishing the gospel among the Gentiles, as we now find it in modern missions to the heathen. The "gift of healing" would not have rendered this useless; since that gift was applicable only in particular cases where its possessors were prompted to employ it by an immediate Divine impulse, or by a spontaneous movement of their feelings. But the case will be different, if we admit that the account in chapter xvi. 10, was taken unaltered from the journal of Timothy, and therefore that he is the speaker who describes himself as one of Paul's companions in the publication of the gospel.

The first Macedonian city in which he stayed was Philippi, a place of some importance. The number of Jews here was not sufficient to enable them to establish a synagogue. Probably there were only Proselytes, who had a place for assembling, surrounded with trees, on the outside of the city, near the banks of the Strymon, where they performed their devotions and the necessary lustrations, a so-called *προσευχή*.† If addresses founded on passages in the Old Testament were not delivered here as in the Jewish synagogue, and if Paul could not avail himself of such a custom for publishing the gospel; still the Proselytes (especially females) assembled here on the Sabbath for prayer, and he would here meet those who were in a state of the greatest preparation and susceptibility for what he wished to communicate. Accordingly, early in the morning on the Sabbath, he resorted thither with his companions, to hold a conversation on religious topics with the women of the city who were assembled for prayer. His words made an impression on the heart of Lydia, a dealer in purple from the town of Thyatira in Lydia. At the conclusion of the service, she and her whole family were baptized by him, and compelled him to take up his abode, with his companions, in her house.‡ From the family of Lydia Christianity spread farther among

* A physician according to Coloss. iv. 14, perhaps one of the Proselytes of the gate converted by Paul at Antioch.

† The expression in Acts xvi. 13, "where was wont," *ὅθι ἐποιήζετο*, makes it probable that this *προσευχή* was not a building, but only an enclosed place in the open air, which was usually applied to this purpose: compare Tertullian, *ad Nationes*, i. 13, "The *Orationes Litorales* of the Jews," and *De Jejuniis*, c. 16, where he speaks of the widely-spread interest taken by the heathen in the Jewish feasts; "Judaicum certe jejunium ubique celebratur, quum omissis templis per omne litus quocunque in aperto aliquando jam preces ad cœlum mittunt." (The Jewish fast is everywhere celebrated, when, temples being neglected, along the shore in any open place whatever, they send up their prayers to heaven.)

‡ I can by no means admit, with some expositors of the Acts, that all this took place before the beginning of the public exercises of devotion, and that on the same day, as

the inhabitants of the city, and her house became the first place of assembly for the believers. As in this town there were few or no Jews, the adherents of Judaism consisted only of proselytes; thus Christianity met in this quarter with no obstinate resistance; and it would have probably gained a still greater number of adherents, without incurring the risk of persecution, if opposition had not been excited by certain individuals among the Gentiles, whose pecuniary interests were injured by the operation of the divine doctrine.

There was a female slave, who, in a state resembling the phenomena of somnambulism,* was accustomed to answer unconsciously questions proposed to her, and was esteemed to be a prophetess inspired by Apollo;† for in all the forms of heathenish idolatry, the hidden powers of nature were taken into the service of religion.‡ This slave had probably frequent opportunities of hearing Paul, and his words had left an impression on her heart. In her convulsive fits, these impressions were revived, and mingling what she had heard from Paul with her own heathenish notions, she frequently followed the preachers when on their way to the *Proseuche*, exclaiming, "These men are the servants of the Most High God, who show unto us the way of salvation." This testi-

they were returning from the place where Paul baptized Lydia, the meeting with the prophetess occurred on their way to the *Proseuche*. Luke's narrative in Acts xvi. 16, does not indicate that all these events took place on one day. The assertions of the prophetess make it probable that she had often heard Paul speak.

* Even if we were not in a position fully to understand from the representation given in the Acts, the incident here narrated, yet we should not be justified in regarding it with Baur as a designed fabrication, with which everything else in the character of this book is at variance. Do we not find in history many an enigmatical appearance which yet gives us no right to call in question the truth of a narrative? We see no reason in all that Baur says, that can induce us to surrender our view of the matter. We recognise the same principle acting in this prophetess as in the *μαντική* of the ancients, and in their oracles, in which certainly not everything can be accounted as a deception. That from our well-established position, which is neither that of crude supernaturalism, nor that of Dr. Baur's rationalism, we are fully justified in distinguishing between the objective and subjective in the account, we need not point out after the foregoing investigations.

† On the common notion of the people, that the Pythian Apollo took possession of such *ἐγγαστριμύθους* or *πυθῶνας*, and spoke through their mouth, see Plutarch, *De Def. Oraculor.* c. 9. Tertullian describes such persons, *Apologet.* c. 23, "qui de Deo pati existimantur, qui anhelando" (i. e., in a state of convulsive agony, in which the person feels himself powerfully impelled as by a strange spirit, with a hollow voice) "præfantur."

‡ Thus the oracles of the ancients, the incubations, and similar phenomena in the heathenism of the Society Isles in the South Sea. The Priest of Oro, the God of War, uttered oracles in an ecstatic state of violent convulsions, and, after his conversion to Christianity, could not again put himself in such a state. See, on this subject, the late interesting accounts of this mission by Ellis, Bennet, etc. In contradiction to Baur's interpretation of my words, I must remark, that I have made this comparison by no means in reference to the effects resulting from a conversion—that I by no means assumed that the female in question, by her conversion, *had* lost the capability of putting herself into such a condition; but my only point of comparison was this, that, generally, that capability *might* be lost.

mony of a prophetess so admired by the people might have availed much to draw their attention to the new doctrine; but it was very foreign from Paul's disposition to employ or endure such a mixture of truth and falsehood. At first, he did not concern himself about the exclamations of the slave. But as she persisted, he at last turned to her, and commanded the spirit which held her rational and moral powers in bondage, to come out of her. If this was not a personal evil spirit, still it was the ascendancy of an ungodly spirit. That which constitutes man a free agent, and which ought to rule over the tendencies and powers of his nature, was here held in subjection to them.* And by the divine power of that Saviour who had restored peace and harmony to the distracted souls of demoniacs, this woman was also rescued from the power of such an ungodlike spirit, and could never again be brought into that state. When, therefore, the slave could no longer practise her arts of sooth-saying, her masters saw themselves deprived of the gains which they had hitherto obtained from this source. Enraged, they seized Paul and Silas, and accused them before the civil authorities, the *Duumvirs*,† as turbu-

* We have no certain marks which will enable us to determine in what light Paul viewed the phenomenon. It might be (though we cannot decide with certainty) that he gave to the heathen notion, that the spirit of Apollo animated this person, a Jewish form, that an evil spirit or demon possessed her. In this case, he followed the universally received notion, without reflecting at the moment any further upon it, for this subject belonging to the higher philosophy of nature, was far from his thoughts. He directed his attention only to the moral grounds of the phenomenon. I am convinced that the Spirit of truth who was promised to him as an apostle, guided him in this instance to the knowledge of all the truth which Christ appeared on earth to announce, to a knowledge of every thing essential to the doctrine of salvation. By this Spirit he discerned the predominance of the reign of evil in this phenomenon; and if an invisible power also is here thought to be operating, yet what is natural in the causes and symptoms is not thereby excluded, even as the natural does not exclude the supernatural. Compare the admirable remarks of my friend Twisten in the second volume of his *Dogmatik*, p. 355, and what is said on demoniacs in my *Life of Christ*. This Spirit gave Paul the confident belief, that as Christ had conquered and rendered powerless the kingdom of evil, so by his divine power every thing which belonged to this kingdom might henceforth be overcome. In this faith, he spoke full of divine confidence, and his word took effect in proportion to his faith. But in the words of Christ, and the declarations of the apostle respecting him, I find no ground for admitting, that with this light of his Christian consciousness, an error in a question which did not affect the truths of the gospel, but belonged to a different and lower department of knowledge could by no possibility have existed; a question, such as whether we are to consider this as a phenomenon explicable from the nature of the human soul, its natural powers and connexion with a bodily organization, or an effect of a possession by a personal evil spirit. What Dr. Baur has said against the view I have taken of this transaction, may appear well-founded from the stand-point of his arbitrary *aut-aut*, which is very convenient to this whole party for the contradiction of what will not suit their presuppositions, but which will be at once dismissed by those who take the trouble to enter into the connexion of the idea presented.

† The name *στρατηγοί* which is used in the Acts to designate these magistrates, was anciently employed in the smaller Greek cities to designate the supreme authorities. See Aristotle's *Politic*, l. vii. c. 3, ed. Bekker, vol. ii. p. 1322, "In these small cities there was

lent Jews, who were attempting to introduce Jewish religious practices into the Roman colony, which was contrary to the Roman laws, though the right was guaranteed to the Jews of practising their national cultus for themselves without molestation. After they had been publicly scourged without further examination, they were cast into prison. The feeling of public ignominy and of bodily pain, confinement in a gloomy prison, where their feet were stretched in a painful manner, and fastened in the stocks (*nervus*),* and the expectation of the ill-treatment which might yet await them—all this could not depress their souls; on the contrary, they were rather elevated by the consciousness that they were enduring reproach and pain for the cause of Christ. About midnight they united in offering prayer and praise to God,† when an earthquake shook the walls of their prison. The doors flew open, and the fetters of the prisoners were loosened. The keeper of the prison was seized with the greatest alarm, believing that the prisoners had escaped; but Paul and Silas calmed his fears. This earthquake which gave the prisoners an opportunity of recovering their liberty—their refusing to avail themselves of this opportunity—their serenity and confidence under so many sufferings—all combined to make them appear in the eyes of the astonished jailor as beings of a higher order. He fell at their feet, and calling to mind what he had heard from the lips of Paul and Silas respecting the way of salvation announced by them, addressed them in their own words: what then must he do to attain salvation? His whole family assembled to hear the answer, and it was a joyful morning for all. Whether the Duumvirs had become more favorably disposed by what they had learnt in the mean time respecting the prisoners, or that the jailor's report had made an impression upon them, they authorized him to say that Paul and Silas might depart.‡ Had any thing fanatical mingled with that blessed

one ruler for everything, called chief magistrate (*strategos*) and polemarch :” (*ἐν ταῖς μικραῖς πόλεσι μία περὶ πάντων (ἡρχῇ) καλοῦσι δὲ στρατηγοῦς καὶ πολεμάρχους.*)

* Tertullian ad *Martyres*, c. 2. “The foot feels nothing in the stocks when the soul is in heaven.” (*Nihil crus sentit in nervo, quum animus in coelo est.*)

† I must deny the charge brought against me by Baur, p. 151, that I have violently perverted the words of the Acts, where the earthquake is represented as the effect of prayer. I have to do here only with the historical, perceptible connexion of causes. The effect of prayer lies beyond this; but it need not exclude a natural connexion of causes. When a result is presented as the effect of prayer, nothing is thereby determined as to *how* the result was procured, whether God worked through natural causes, or by a miracle. From the point of view with which I have here to do, neither prayer, nor still less the effect procured by prayer, comes properly under notice.

‡ According to Baur, p. 152, the person who fabricated this narrative in order to exalt the apostle Paul above Peter, wished it to be understood, that only the impression of the earthquake as a supernatural evidence of the innocence of the prisoners had induced the Duumvirs to act as they did, which, if it were so, would certainly be an internal mark of improbability. But truly, whoever made it his business so to magnify his heroes, and to set everything in the light of the wonderful, would not have expressed himself so vaguely that a reader could only guess at such a connexion, but would have set the point of view in which the transaction was to be regarded, distinctly before his readers.

inspiration which enabled Paul to endure all shame and all suffering for the cause of the Lord, he certainly would have done nothing to escape disgrace, though it might have been without injury and to the advantage of his calling, or to obtain an apology to which his civil privileges entitled him, for the unmerited treatment he had received. How far were his sentiments from what in later times the morals of monkery have called humility! Appealing to his civil rights,* he obliged the Duumvirs, who were not justified in treating a Roman citizen† so ignominiously, to come to the prison, and, as an attestation of his innocence, with their own lips to release‡ him and his companion. They now betook themselves to the house of Lydia, where the other Christians of the city were assembled, and spoke the last words of encouragement and exhortation. They then quitted the place, but Luke and Timothy, who had not been included in the persecution, stayed behind in peace.§ It is easily explained how Timothy on account of his youth, since he took but little part in the proclamation of the gospel, escaped the persecutions from which Paul and Silas suffered, and could therefore remain without danger at Philippi.

But when Baur, in reference to our filling up of the connexion, thinks that so important a circumstance could not possibly be passed over by a faithful historian, we shall certainly grant that he would have given such an explanation if he had been a pragmatical narrator, and had placed himself altogether on the stand-point of his readers, and had made a point of telling them all they wished to know. But this is not the case; the narrator's only concern was what the Duumvirs did, not the reasons which induced them so to act.

* See the well-known words of Cicero, *Act. II. in Verrem*, v. 57. "*Jam illa vox et imploratio civis Romanus sum, quæ sæpe multis in ultimis terris opem inter barbaros et salutem attulit.*" *That utterance and appeal, "I am a Roman citizen," which has often in remote lands, among barbarians, brought succor and safety.*

† How Paul's father obtained the Roman citizenship we know not. We have no ground for assuming, that Paul was indebted for it to his being born at Tarsus; for though Dio Chrysostom, in his second *λόγος Ταρσικῶς*, vol. ii. ed. Reiske, p. 36, mentions several privileges which the Emperor Augustus had granted to the city of Tarsus as a reward for its fidelity in the civil wars, yet it does not appear that Roman citizenship was one of them, and allowing it to have been so, it may be doubted whether it would have been conferred on a foreign Jewish family, to which Paul belonged. Silas also must have obtained by some means the right of a Roman citizen.

‡ Baur finds it improbable that Paul did not, in this case, appeal earlier to his civil rights, since he might thus at the beginning have avoided everything that had befallen them. But in the tumultuous confusion of the transaction Paul might have had no opportunity to protest against the violation of his right of citizenship. In a Roman colony, little courtesy would be likely to be paid to two Jews charged with violating the law by religious proselyting. That Paul thrice suffered punishment to which he was not subject according to Roman law, appears from his own words, 2 Cor. xi. 25; and we cannot suppose that in any one of these cases he would have submitted to such ignominious treatment, if by appealing to his civil rights he could have avoided it.

§ Timothy rejoined Paul at Thessalonica or Beroea; and Luke at a later period; in which case, not Timothy alone is to be thought of as the one speaking in the first person. in the narrative of the Acts.

Paul left in Philippi a church full of faith and zeal, who shortly after gave a proof of their affectionate concern for him by sending contributions for his maintenance, though he never sought for such gifts, but supported himself by the labor of his own hands.

Paul and Silas now directed their course to Thessalonica, about twenty miles distant, the largest city of Macedonia, and a place of considerable traffic, where many Jews resided. Here they found a synagogue, which for three weeks Paul visited on the Sabbath; the hearts of many proselytes were won by his addresses; and through them a way was opened for publishing the gospel among the heathen in the city. From what Paul says in 1 Thess. i. 9, 10; ii. 10, 11,* we find that he was not satisfied with addressing the proselytes only once a week at the meetings of the synagogue; his preaching would then have been confined to the small number of Gentiles who belonged to the proselytes. At the meetings of the synagogue, he could adopt only such a method and form of address as suited the views of the Jews; he must have assumed many things, and many topics he could not have developed, which required to be fully discussed, in order to meet the peculiar exigencies of the heathen. But he knew, as we see from several examples, how to distinguish between the different views and wants of the Jews and Gentiles; and hence, we may presume, that he found opportunities to adapt himself to these differences. It is certain that the Gentiles, whose attention was awakened by the proselytes, soon assembled in various places to hear him, and from them chiefly a church was formed, professing faith in the one living God, as well as faith in the Redeemer.

Agreeably to the declarations of Christ Matt. x. 10, (compared with 1 Cor. ix. 14), Paul recognised the justice of the requirement, that the maintenance of the preachers of the gospel should be furnished by those for whom they expended their whole strength and activity, and on whom they thus conferred the highest benefit. But since he was conscious that in one point he was inferior to the other apostles, not having at first joined himself voluntarily to the Redeemer, but having been by the divine grace, as it were against his will, transformed from a violent persecutor of the church into an apostle, he thought it his duty to sacrifice a right belonging to the apostolic office, in order to evince his readiness and delight in the calling which was laid upon him by a higher necessity; (1 Cor. ix. 16-18). Thus also he found the means of promoting his apostolic labors among the heathen; for a ministry so manifestly disinterested, sacrificing every thing for the good of others, and undergoing all toils and deprivations, must have won the confidence of many, even

* Schrader, in his Chronological Remarks, p. 95, thinks that these passages cannot possibly refer to Paul's first visit to Thessalonica, which must have been a very short one. But there seems nothing improbable in the supposition, that a man of such zeal and indefatigable activity in his calling, would in the space of three or four weeks effect so much, and leave behind him so vivid an impression of his character and conduct as is implied in these passages.

of those who otherwise were disposed to suspect selfish motives in a zeal for the best interests of others which they could not appreciate. He must have been the more anxious to remove every pretext for such a suspicion, because the conduct of many Jews who were active in making proselytes, was calculated to cast such an imputation on the Jewish teachers in general. The other apostles in their youth had earned their livelihood by a regular employment, but yet one which they could not follow in every place; Paul, on the other hand, though destined to be a Jewish theologian, yet according to the maxims prevalent in the Jewish schools,* along with the study of the law, had learned the art of tent-making; and he easily gained a maintenance by this handicraft, wherever he went, on account of the mode of travelling in the East, and the manifold occasions on which tents† were used. While anxiety for the spiritual wants of the heathen and the new converts to Christianity wholly occupied his mind, he was forced to employ the night in earning the necessities of life for himself and his companions (1 Thess. ii. 9; Acts xx. 34), excepting as far as he obtained some relief by the affectionate voluntary offerings of the church at Philippi. Phil. iv. 16. But to him it was happiness to give to others without receiving anything in return from them; from his own experience he knew the truth of the Lord's words, "It is more blessed to give than to receive." Acts xx. 35.

The apostle not only publicly addressed the church, but visited individuals in their families, and impressed on their hearts the fundamental truths of the gospel in private conversations, or warned them of the dangers that threatened the Christian life.‡ He endeavored to cherish the hopes of believers under the sufferings of their earthly life, by pointing them to the period when Christ would come again to bring his kingdom among mankind to a victorious consummation. And we have already pointed out how near this decisive event must have appeared to the apos-

* In the Pirke Avoth, c. 2, § 2, *נִפְסָה תִלְמִיד הַזֵּקֶה עִם דִּרְהָ אֶרֶץ*, "Beautiful is the study of the law with an earthly employment, by which a man gains his livelihood;" and the reason alleged is, that both together are preventives of sin, but in their absence, the soul is easily ruined, and sin finds entrance. And thus as in monasteries, occupation by manual labor had for its object, not simply to make provision for the support of the body, but also to prevent sensuality from mingling with higher spiritual employments.

† Philo de Victimis, 836, ed. Francof. "The hair and skins of goats, woven and sewed together, make movable tents for travellers, and especially for those engaged in military affairs," *ἀλγῶν δὲ αἱ τρίχες, αἱ δοραὶ συννυφαινόμεναί τε καὶ συβραπτόμεναι, φορητὰ γεγόνασιν ὁδοιπόροις οἰκίαι καὶ μάλιστα τοῖς ἐν στρατείαις*. This indicates, though it does not prove, that Paul chose this occupation from its being one for which his native country was celebrated; hence, too, we read of *tentoria Cilicina*.

‡ We do not see why the exhortations and warnings given to the Christians at Thessalonica, to which Paul appeals in both his Epistles, might not have been communicated during his first residence among them; for would not Paul's wisdom and knowledge of human nature, foresee the dangers likely to arise, and endeavor to fortify his disciples against them? Schrader's argument deduced from this circumstance, against the dates commonly offered to these two Epistles, is not, therefore, very weighty.

tolic view. Under the sufferings and shame which he endured at Philippi, the anticipation of this divine triumph inspired him all the more. Filled with these sentiments, he came to Thessalonica, and with an elevation of feeling, which naturally communicated itself to other minds, he testified of the hope that animated him, and raised him above all earthly sufferings. But as his inspiration was far removed from every mixture of that fanaticism, which cannot separate the subjective feeling and mental views from what belongs to faith and the confidence of faith, he by no means spoke of the nearness of that great event as absolutely determined; he adhered with modest sobriety to the saying of the Lord, that "it was not for men to know the times and seasons." And with apostolic discretion he endeavored to warn the new converts lest, by filling their imaginations with visions of the felicity of the approaching reign of Christ, and wrapping themselves in pleasing dreams, they should forget the necessary preparations for the future, and for the impending conflict. He foretold them that they had still many sufferings and many struggles to endure, before they could attain the undisturbed enjoyment of blessedness in the kingdom of Christ.

Though the apostle, in opposition to the pretensions of meritorious works and moral self-sufficiency advanced by Judaizing teachers, earnestly set forth the doctrine of justification, not by human works which are ever defective, but by appropriating the grace of redemption through faith alone; yet he also deemed it of importance to warn the new converts against another misapprehension to which a superficial conversion, or a confusion of the common Jewish notions of faith with the Pauline, might expose them; namely, the false representation of those who held that a renunciation of idolatry, and the acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messiah, without the life-transforming influence of such a conviction, was sufficient to place them on a better footing than the heathen, and to secure them from the divine judgments that threatened the heathen world.* He often charged them most impressively, to manifest in the habitual tenor of their lives the change effected in their hearts by the gospel; and declared that their criminality would be aggravated, if, after they had been devoted to God by redemption and baptism to serve him with a holy life, they returned to their former vices, and thus defiled their bodies and souls which had been made the temples of the Holy Spirit. 1 Thess. iv. 8; ii. 12.

But the speedy and cordial reception which the gospel met with among the Gentiles, roused the fanatical fury and zealotry of many Jews, who had already been exasperated by the apostle's discourse in the syna-

* These are the "vain words," *κενοὶ λόγοι*, Eph. v. 6, of which Paul thought it necessary so solemnly to warn the Gentile Christians. Hence, warning them against such a superficial Christianity, he reminds them that every vicious person resembles an idolater, and would be equally excluded from the kingdom of God; that not merely for idolatry, but for every unsubdued vice, unbelievers would be exposed to the divine condemnation.

gogue. They stirred up some of the common people who forced their way into the house of Jason a Christian, where Paul was staying. But as they did not find the apostle, they dragged Jason and some other Christians before the judgment-seat. As on this occasion the persecution originated with the Jews, who merely employed the Gentiles as their tools, the accusation brought against the publishers of the new doctrine was not the same as that made at Philippi; they were not charged, as in other cases, with having disturbed the Jews in the peaceful exercise of their own mode of worship as guaranteed to them by the laws.* As Paul had labored here for the most part among the Gentiles, the grounds were too slight for supporting such an accusation, especially as the civil authorities were not predisposed to receive it. At this time, a political accusation, the *crimen majestatis*, was likely to be more successful, a device that was often employed in a similar way, at a later period, by the enemies of the Christian faith. Paul had spoken much at Thessalonica of the approaching kingdom of Christ, to which believers already belonged; and by distorting his expressions, the accusation was rendered plausible. He instigated people (it was averred) to acknowledge one Jesus as supreme ruler instead of Cæsar. But the authorities, when they saw the persons before them who were charged with being implicated in the conspiracy, could not credit such an accusation; and after Jason and his friends had given security that there should be no violation of the public peace, and that those persons who had been the alleged causes of this disturbance should soon leave the city, they were dismissed.

On the evening of the same day Paul and Silas left the city, after a residence of three or four weeks. As Paul could not remain there as long as the necessities of the newly formed church required, his anxiety was awakened on its behalf, since he foresaw that it would have to endure much persecution from the Gentiles at the instigation of the Jews. He had formed, therefore, the intention of returning thither as soon as the first storm of the popular fury had subsided; 1 Thess. ii. 18. Possibly

* Baur imagines (p. 482) that he has detected something unhistorical in Acts xvii. 6. "How could it be said of Paul and his companions, since it was for the first time they had visited these parts, that they had thrown the 'whole world' (*οικουμένην*) into confusion?" But is it not natural, that impassioned accusers, who wished to make the most of the object that roused their enmity, should use the language of exaggeration? Baur says farther, "What a long time intervened before Christianity appeared so politically dangerous to the Romans as is implied in the words 'contrary to the decrees of Cæsar' (*ἀπέναντι*," &c.) Certainly it was a long interval before Christianity appeared as a religion dangerous to the state in the sense in which it was so esteemed in the second century. But it was something quite different when the acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messiah was perverted into a design to establish a worldly kingdom, and to set up another ruler against the Roman Emperor. Such an accusation had already been made against Jesus himself, and in the first age of Christianity no other could be found. At a later period, quite different accusations were brought against the Christians as viewed from the Roman civil law.

he left Timothy behind,* who had not been an object of persecution, unless he met him first at Berea, after leaving Philippi. Paul and Silas now proceeded to Berea; a town about ten miles distant, where they met with a better reception from the Jews; the gospel here found acceptance also with the Gentiles; but a tumult raised by Jews from Thessalonica forced Paul to leave the place almost immediately. Accompanied by some believers from Berea, he then directed his course to Athens.†

Though the consequences which resulted from the apostle's labors at Athens were at first inconsiderable, yet his appearance in this city (which in a different sense from Rome might be called the metropolis of the world), was in real importance unquestionably one of the most memorable signs of the new spiritual creation. A herald of that divine doctrine which, fraught with divine power, was destined to change the principles and practices of the ancient world, Paul came to Athens, the parent of Grecian culture and philosophy; the city to which, as the grecian element had imbued the culture of the West, the whole Roman world was indebted for its mental advancement; which also was the central point of the Grecian religion, where an enthusiastic attachment to all that belonged to ancient Hellas, not excepting its idolatry, retained a firm hold till the fourth century. Zeal for the honor of the gods, each one of whom had here his temple and his altars, and was celebrated by the masterpieces of art, rendered Athens famous throughout the civilized world.‡ It was at first Paul's intention to wait for the arrival of Silas and Timothy before he entered on the publication of the gospel, as by his companions who had returned to Berea he had sent word for them to follow him as soon as possible. But when he saw himself surrounded by the statues, and altars, and temples of the gods, and works of art, by which the honor due to the living God alone was transferred to

* Since the departure of Timothy is not mentioned, Acts xvii. 10.

† It is doubtful whether Paul went by land or by sea to Athens; the *ὧς* in Acts xvii. 14, may be understood simply as marking the direction of his route. See Winer's *Grammatik*, 3d ed. p. 498. (6th ed. p. 544; Eng. tr. p. 640.) Berea lay near the sea, and this way was the shortest. But the *ὧς* may also signify, that they took at first their course towards the sea, in order to mislead the Jews (who expected them to come that way, and were lying in wait for Paul in the neighborhood of the port), and afterwards pursued their journey by land. So we find on another occasion, when Paul was about to sail from Corinth to Asia Minor, he found himself in danger from the plots of the Jews, and preferred going by land; Acts xx. 3. The first interpretation appears to be the simplest and most favored by the context. The *ἐως* adopted by Lachmann [and Tischendorf, Lips. 1841] appears to have arisen from a gloss.

‡ Apollonius of Tyana (in Philostratus) calls the Athenians "sacrificers," *φιλοθυσταί*. Pausanias ascribes to them (*Athic.* i. 17), *τὸ εἰς θεοὺς εὐσεβεῖν ἄλλων πλεόν*, (a surpassing of others in their reverence for the Gods;) and (c. 24), *τὸ περισσότερον τῆς εἰς τὰ θεῖα σπουδῆς*, (excess of zeal for divine things.) In the religious system of the Athenians, there was a peculiar refinement of moral sentiment, for they alone among the Greeks erected an altar to Pity, *ἔλεος*, as a divinity.

creatures of the imagination, he could not withstand the impulse of holy zeal, to testify of Him who called erring men to repentance and offered them salvation. He spoke in the synagogue to the Jews and Proselytes, but did not wait, as in other cities till a way was opened by their means for publishing the gospel to the heathen.

From ancient times it was customary at Athens for people to meet together under covered porticoes in public places, to converse with one another on matters of all kinds, trifling or important; and then, as in the time of Demosthenes, groups of persons might be met with in the market, collected together merely to hear of something new.* Accordingly, Paul made it his business to enter into conversation with the passers-by, in hopes of turning their attention to the most important concern of man. The sentiments with which he was inspired had nothing in common with the enthusiasm of the fanatic, who is unable to transport himself from his own peculiar state of feeling to the position of others, in order to make himself acquainted with the obstacles that oppose their reception of what he holds with absolute certainty as truth. Paul knew, indeed, as he himself says, that the preaching of the crucified Saviour must appear to the wise men of the world as foolishness, until they became fools, that is, until they were convinced of the insufficiency of their wisdom in reference to the knowledge of divine things, and for the satisfaction of their religious wants; 1 Cor. i. 23; iii. 18. But he was not ashamed, as he also affirms, to testify to the wise and the unwise, to the Greeks and to the barbarians, of what he knew from his own experience to be the power of God to save those that believe; Rom. i. 16. The market to which he resorted was near a portico of the philosophers. Here he met with philosophers of the Epicurean and Stoic schools. If we reflect upon the relative position of the Stoics to the Epicureans, that the *former* acknowledged something divine as the animating principle in the universe and in human nature, that they were inspired with an ideal founded in the moral nature of man, and that they recognised man's religious wants and the traditions that bore testimony to it;—while on the other hand, the *latter*, though they did not absolutely do away with the belief in the gods, reduced it to something inert, non-essential, and superfluous; that they represented pleasure as the highest aim of human pursuit, and that they were accustomed to ridicule the existing religions as the offspring of human weakness and the spectral creations of fear; we might from such a contrast infer that the Stoics made a much nearer approach to Christianity than the Epicureans. But it does not follow that the former would give a more favorable reception to the gospel than the latter, for their vain notion of moral self-

* As Demosthenes reproaches them in his oration against the epistle of Philip; *ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐδὲν ποιοῦντες ἐνθάδε καθήμεθα καὶ πυνθανόμενοι κατὰ τὴν ἀγορὰν, εἴ τι λέγεται νεώτερον.* (We sit here doing nothing, and inquire along the market if there is anything new afloat); Acts xvii. 21.

sufficiency was diametrically opposed to a doctrine which inculcated repentance, forgiveness of sins, grace, and justification by faith. Their supreme God—the impersonal, eternal reason pervading the universe—was something very different from the living God, the heavenly Father full of love whom the gospel reveals, and who must have appeared to the Stoics as far too human a being; and both parties agreed in the Grecian pride of philosophy, which would look down on a doctrine appearing in a Jewish garb, and not developed in a philosophic form, as a mere outlandish superstition.

The derisive designation applied by the Athenians to the new religion announced by Paul, shows plainly what he made the chief topic of his addresses, and by what method he handled it. He did not begin with the Old Testament, as if he had been instructing Jews, nor represent Jesus as the Messiah spoken of by the prophets. Hence his hearers were very far from seeing in him an advocate of the Jewish religion. He testified of Jesus as the Saviour of all men, accredited by God, and of his reappearance after being raised from the dead to an existence raised above all death, as a pledge of the same eternal life for all who were willing to accept the offered salvation. This was doctrine adapted to the religious wants of all. The Athenians confined themselves to what the apostle constantly discoursed of—Jesus and the resurrection—without troubling themselves about the import of these.*

Yet many among those who gathered around the apostle during his conversations, were at least pleased to hear something new; and their curiosity was excited to hear of the strange divinity whom he wished to introduce, and to be informed respecting his new doctrine. They took him to the hill, where the first tribunal at Athens, the Areopagus, was accustomed to hold its sittings, and where he could easily find a spot suited to a large audience.† The discourse of Paul on this occasion is a living demonstration of his apostolic wisdom and eloquence: we here perceive how the apostle (to use his own language) to the heathens became a heathen, that he might gain the heathens to Christianity.

Inspired by feelings that were implanted from youth in the mind of a pious Jew, and glowing with zeal for the honor of his God, Paul must have been horror-struck at the spectacle of the idolatry that met him wherever he turned his eyes. He might easily have been betrayed by his feelings into intemperate language. And it evinced no ordinary self-

* When Baur regards this whole narrative taken from the life, as a mere fabrication made with deliberate design, I need only, without wearying myself and intelligent readers with a refutation of particulars, since the same game is constantly repeated, appeal to what I have already said against this whole method, which makes a subjective pragmatism out of an objective one.

† The whole course of the proceedings and the apostle's discourse prove that he did not appear as an accused person before his judges, in order to defend himself against the charge of introducing foreign and unlawful religions, *religiones peregrinæ et illicitæ*. The Athenians did not view the subject in so serious a light.

denial and self-command, that instead of beginning with expressions of detestation, instead of representing the whole religious system of the Greeks as a Satanic delusion, he appealed to the truth which lay at its basis, while he sought to awaken in his hearers the primitive consciousness of God which was only repressed by the power of sin, and thus aimed at leading them to the knowledge of that Saviour whom he came to announce. As among the Jews, in whom the knowledge of God had been carried by divine revelation to a clear and pure development of the idea of the Messiah, he could appeal to the national history, the law and the prophets, as witnesses of Christ; so here he appealed to the undeniable anxiety of natural religion after an unknown God. He began with acknowledging in the religious zeal of the Athenians a true religious feeling, though erroneously directed, an undeniable tending of the mind towards something divine.* He begins with acknowledging in a laudatory manner the strength of the religious sentiment among the Athenians,†

* Much depends on the meaning attached to the ambiguous word *δεισιδαίμων*, "superstitious," Acts xvii. 22. The original signification of this word, in popular usage, certainly denoted something good—as is the case in all languages with words which denote the fear of God or of the gods—the feeling of dependence on a higher power, which, if we analyse the religious sentiment, appears to be its original element; although it is not exhaustive of all which belongs to the essential nature of theism, and although, without the addition of another element, it may give rise to superstition as well as faith. Now since, where the feeling of fear (*δειλία πρὸς τὸ δαιμόνιον*, *Theophrast.*) is the ruling determining principle in the conscience, superstition alone can be the result, it has happened that this word has been, by an abuse of the term, applied to that perversion of religious sentiment. This phraseology was then prevalent. Thus Plutarch uses the word in his admirable treatise *περὶ δεισιδαιμονίας καὶ ἀθεότητος*, in which he proceeds on the supposition, that the source of superstition is that mode of thinking which contemplates the gods only as objects of fear; but he errs in this point, that he traces the origin of this morbid tendency to a wrong direction of the intellectual faculties. Compare the profound remarks of Nietzsche, in his treatise on the religious ideas of the ancients. The word *δεισιδαιμονία* occurs in the New Testament only in one other passage, Acts xxv. 19, where the Roman procurator Festus, speaking to the Jewish King Agrippa of Judaism, could not intend to brand it as superstition, but rather used the word as a general designation for a foreign religion. He might, however, have chosen this word, although not with a special design, yet not quite accidentally, as one which was suited to express the subjective view taken by the Romans of Judaism. But Paul certainly used the word in a good sense, for he deduced the seeking after the unknown God, which he doubtless considered as something good, from this *δεισιδαιμονία*, so prevalent among the Athenians. He announced himself as one who would guide their *δεισιδαιμονία*, not rightly conscious of its object and aim, to a state of clear self-consciousness, by a revelation of the object to which it thus ignorantly tended. Still it may be asked, whether Paul had not deeper reasons (though without perhaps reflecting specially upon them) for using the word *δεισιδαιμονία*, instead of another which he was accustomed to use as the designation of pure piety. He uses the term *εὐσεβεῖν* immediately afterwards, where it plainly indicates the exercise of the religious sentiment towards the true God.

† In the comparative *δεισιδαιμονεστέρους*, a reference is made to the quality which, as we have before remarked, used to be attributed to the Athenians in a higher degree than to all the other Greeks,—a fact which the apostle would easily have learned.

and adducing as a proof of it, that while walking amongst their sacred edifices, he came upon an altar dedicated to an unknown God.*

The inscription, certainly as understood by those who framed it, by no means proved that they were animated with the conception of an unknown God exalted above all other gods; but only that according to their belief they had received good or evil from some unknown god, and this uncertainty in respect to the completeness of their worship, enters into the very essence of Polytheism, since, according to its nature, it may include an infinity of objects. But Paul cited this inscription, attaching a deeper meaning to it, to make it a point of connexion† for pointing out a higher but indistinct sentiment lying at the root of Polytheism. Polytheism proceeds from the feeling of dependence (whether founded on a sense of benefits conferred or of evils inflicted) on a higher

* If we examine with care all the accounts of antiquity, and compare the various phases of polytheism, we shall find no sufficient ground for denying the existence of an altar actually bearing the inscription here mentioned by Paul. The inscription, as he cites it, and which proves his fidelity in the citation, by no means asserts that it was an altar to the Unknown God, but only an altar dedicated to *an* unknown God. Jerome, it is true, in the first chapter of his Commentary on the Epistle of Paul to Titus, and in his *Epistola ad Magnum*, thus cites the inscription of the altar: *Diis Asiæ et Europiæ et Libyæ, Diis ignotis et peregrinis*, (to the Gods of Asia, Europe, and Africa, to the unknown and foreign gods); and he thinks that Paul may have modified the form of the inscription to suit his application of it. But Jerome, perhaps, here as in other instances, judged too superficially. Several ancient writers mention the altars of the unknown gods at Athens, but in a manner that does not determine the form of the inscription. For example; Pausanias, *Attic.* i. 4, and *Eliac.* v. 14, *βωμοὶ θεῶν ὀνομαζομένων ἀγνώστων*, (altars of the so-called unknown gods), Apollonius of Tyana, in Philostratus, vi; 3, where, like Paul, he finds in the style of the inscription an evidence of the pious disposition of the Athenians in reference to divine things, that they had erected altars even to unknown gods; *σωφρονέστερον τὸ περὶ πάντων θεῶν εὖ λέγειν, καὶ ταῦτα Ἀθηναίων, οὐ καὶ ἀγνώστων δαιμόνων βωμοὶ ἰδρύνται*, (it is wiser to speak well of all the gods, especially at Athens, where altars are set up even to unknown divinities). Isodorus of Pelusium, vi. 69, cannot be adduced as an authority, since he merely speaks of conjectures. Diogenes Laërtius says, in the life of Epimenides III., that, in the time of a plague, when they knew not what god to propitiate in order to avert it, he caused black and white sheep to be let loose from the Areopagus, and wherever they lay down, to be offered to the respective divinity (*τῷ προσήκοντι θεῷ*). Hence, says Diogenes, there are still altars in Athens without determinate names. Although the precise inscription is not here given, yet altars might be erected on this or a similar occasion which were dedicated to an unknown god, since they knew not what god was offended and required to be propitiated, as Chrysostom has also remarked in his 38th homily on the Acts. If this had been a fabrication of the Author of the Acts, he would have been more likely to use *τῷ ἀγνώστῳ*, which would have better suited his purpose.

† The employment, as a point of departure, of a truth which lay at the basis of an expression used on a lower stand-point of religious consciousness, and which was not clearly developed in the souls of those using it, cannot possibly admit of the interpretation given by Baur, p. 176, for the purpose of showing the unhistorical character of the addresses: "that Paul would have been chargeable with an obvious violation of the truth." According to such a view many applications of the Old Testament in the New must be violations of the truth.

unknown power, to which it is needful that man should place himself in the right relation; but instead of following this feeling, in order by means of that in human nature which is supernatural and allied to God, to rise to a consciousness of a God exalted above nature, he refers it only to the powers of nature operating upon him through the senses. That by which man's natural religious feeling is immediately drawn, and to which it refers itself, without his reflective consciousness making it a distinct object, is one thing: but that which the mind, enthralled in the circle of nature, doing homage to the power over which it ought to rule, converts with reflective consciousness into an object of worship, is another thing. Hence Paul views the whole religion of the Athenians as the worship of a God unknown to themselves, and presents himself as a person who is ready to lead them to a clear self-consciousness as regards their own religious feeling.

"I announce to you Him," said he, "whom ye worship, without knowing it.* He is the God who created the world and all that is therein. He, the Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in the temples made by human hands, he requires no human service on his own account; He, the all-sufficient One, has given to all, life, and breath, and all things. He also is the originator of the whole human race, and conducts its development to one great end. He has caused all the nations of the earth to descend from one man,† and has not allowed them to spread by chance

* We see from this how Paul psychologically or genetically explained the origin of polytheism, or the deification of nature, and how far he was from adopting the Jewish notion of a supernatural, magical origination of idolatry by means of evil spirits, who sought to become the objects of religious homage. The idea contained in these words of Paul forms also the groundwork of his discourse at Lystra. We may also find a reference to it in what he says, Rom. i. 19, of an original knowledge of God, suppressed by the predominance of immoral propensities; and Rom. i. 21, 25, that idolatry begins when religious sentiment cleaves to the creature, instead of rising above nature to the Creator. On the first passage, see Tholuck's, and on the second, Rückert's, excellent remarks.

† This also is probably connected with what he says in opposition to polytheistic views. In polytheism, a knowledge of the unity of human nature is wanting, because such knowledge is closely connected with a knowledge of the unity of God. Polytheism prefers the idea of distinct races over whom their respective gods preside, to the idea of one race proceeding from one origin. For the idea of one God is substituted that of a multiplicity of gods, and so for the idea of one human race is substituted that of the multiplicity of national types, over each of which a god is supposed to preside corresponding to the particular nation. The philosophy of the ancients lacked the idea of a unity of mankind, not only as to their origin, but also as to their peculiar nature and the end of their development. It lacked in general the unitive and teleological point of view which Christianity first brought to light. Inasmuch as every thing led to the assumption of, in a certain sense at least, a beginning, from which the development of the existing race has proceeded, they denied only an *absolute* beginning. They fancied themselves in a circular course, without an end, between the dissolution of the old race and the beginning of the new, an alternation of passing away and becoming; *vide* Plato's *Timæus*, vol. ix. ed. Bip. p. 291; *Politicus*, vol. vi. p. 32. Aristotle, *Metaphys.* l. xii. c. 8, vol. ii. ed. Bekker, p. 1074. Polyb. *Hist.* l. vi. c. 5. § 5, 6. On the other hand, the idea of one human race, and their descent from one man, is connected with the idea of one God. Thus Paul sets

over the globe; for, in this respect, every thing is under his control; he has appointed to each people its dwelling-place, and has ordained the various eras in the history of nations—their development in space and time is fixed by his all-governing wisdom.* Thus God has revealed himself in the vicissitudes of nations, in order that men may be induced to seek after him, to try whether they may know and find him; and they may easily know him, since he is not far from any one of us, for in him our whole existence has its root.† As an evidence of the consciousness of this original relationship to God, he quotes the words of a heathen, one of themselves, the poet Aratus, who came from the native country of the apostle. “For we are the offspring of God.”‡ After

the unity of the theistic conceptions in contrast with the multiplicity existing in the deification of nature. The Emperor Julian observed this contrast between the polytheistic and monotheistic anthropology and anthropogony. Πανταχοῦ ἀθρώων νευσάντων θεῶν, οἱ πλείους προῆλθον ἄνθρωποι, τοῖς γενεάρχαις θεοῖς ἀποκληρωθέντες, (Every where crowds of gods beckoning, the majority of men came forward, being allotted to the gods as founders of races). See *Julian, Fragmentum ed. Spanheim*, t. i. 295.

* The peculiar relation of the dwelling-places assigned the nations, to their particular characters as determined by natural aptitudes and moral freedom; the secret connexion between nature and mankind ordained by God, and grounded in a higher law of spiritual development.

† The apostle's words are—“in Him we live and move and have our being,” ἐν αὐτῷ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν. Many expositors have explained these words, as if they were intended to denote the continual dependence of existence on God, as the preserver of all things; and without taking the ἐν in an Hebraistic sense = *through*, we might so understand the words in the pure Greek also, for εἶναι ἐν τινι may signify to depend wholly on some one, as ἐν σοὶ γὰρ ἐσμέν, in the *Œdipus Tyrannus* of Sophocles, v. 314. But this explanation does not suit the connexion of the passage; for Paul evidently is speaking here, not of what men have in common with other creatures, but of what distinguishes men from other creatures, that by which they are especially related to God; for as an evidence of this, “in Him we live, and move, and are,” he quotes the words of Aratus, which refer precisely to this relation of man to God. Hence, in order to find the connexion according to this explanation, we must amplify the thought too artificially; thus, “We are distinguished above all other creatures in our capacity for knowing this dependence on God.” On the other hand, every thing is connected in the most natural manner, if we consider the words “in Him we live, move, and are,” as pointing out the secret connexion of men with God as “the Father of Spirits,” in virtue of their spiritual and moral nature. As Paul says nothing here which is peculiar to the Christian system, but expresses a fact grounded on the general principles of theism, we may with great propriety compare it with a perfectly analogous expression of Dio Chrysostom, which serves to confirm this explanation. He says of men—“But since we are removed not far from, nor outside of God, but are by nature in the very midst of him, we are from all sides filled with the divine nature,” ὅτε οὐ μακρὰν οὐδ' ἐξω τοῦ θεοῦ διωκισμένοι, ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτῷ μέσῳ πεφυκότες ἐκείνῳ. πανταχόθεν ἐμπιπλάμενοι τῆς θείας φύσεως.—*De Dei Cognitione*, vol. i. ed. Reiske, p. 384.

‡ These words are quoted from the φαεινομένοις of Aratus, v. 5, but they are also to be found in the beautiful hymn of the stoic Cleanthus, where they are used as an expression of Reason, as a mark of this divine relationship: “We are thy offspring, having alone received the likeness of thy being,” ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ γένος ἐσμεν ἰῆς μίμημα λαχόντες μῦνοι. A similar sentiment occurs in the “Golden Poem,” “For mortals have a divine descent,” θεῖον γὰρ γένος ἐστὶ βροτοῖσιν.

this appeal to the universal higher self-consciousness, he goes on to say; Since we are the offspring of God, we ought not to believe that the divinity is like any earthly material, or any image of human art. This negative assertion manifestly includes a positive one; we must strive to rise to the divinity by means of that within us which is related to him. Instead of carrying on the argument against idolatry, the apostle leaves his hearers to decide for themselves; and presupposing the consciousness of guilt—without attempting to develop it—he proceeds with the annunciation of the gospel. After God had with great long-suffering endured the times of ignorance,* he now revealed the truth to all men, and required all to acknowledge it and repent. With this was connected the annunciation of the Redeemer, of the forgiveness of sins to be obtained through him, and of his resurrection as the confirmation of his doctrine, and as a pledge of the resurrection of believers to a blessed life, as well as of the judgment to be passed by him on mankind.† As long as the apostle confined himself to the general doctrine of Theism, he was heard with attention by those who had been used to the lessons of Grecian philosophy. But when he touched upon that doctrine which most decidedly marked the opposition of the Christian philosophy to that of the heathen,‡ when he spoke of a general resurrection, he was interrupted with ridicule on the part of some of his hearers. Others said, We would hear thee speak at another time on this matter; whether they only intended

* Paul here gives us to understand, that not mere negative unbelief in reference to truth not known, but only criminal unbelief of the gospel offered to men, would be an object of the divine judgment. This agrees with what he says in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, that heathens, as well as Jews, would be judged according to the measure of the law known to them; and with what he says in Rom. iii. 25, of the "remission of sins that are past," *πάρεσις τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων*; and a comparison of this passage with Acts xvii. 30, shows the genuine Pauline character of the speech.

† It is very evident from the form of the expressions in Acts xvii. 31, as well as from verse 32, where the mention of the general resurrection in Paul's speech is implied, that in the Acts, we have only the substance given of what he said; as Schleiermacher has also observed, that after the beginning of the address has been reported in detail, we have only an abstract of the remainder. See his Introduction to the New Testament, 1845, p. 374; and this relieves the address from the reproach brought against it by Baur, who will not recognize it as a Pauline production, that the speaker so soon and so abruptly proceeds to that which must have given the greatest offence to his hearers. But regarding the address as a fabrication, it is clear, that whoever from a Hellenic point of view could have begun it so skilfully, could also have continued and completed it with corresponding skill; and he would not, of course, have failed to do so.

‡ This is expressed in the words of the heathen Octavius, in Minucius Felix, c. xi.: "Cœlo et astris, quæ sic relinquimus ut invenimus, interitum denuntiare; sibi mortuis, extinctis, qui sicut nascimur et interimus, æternitatem repromittere." (To foretell destruction to the heaven and the stars which we leave as we find them; to promise eternity to ourselves, dead and extinct, who, as we are born, also perish.) The doctrine of the Stoics, of an *ἀναστροφίσις*, the regeneration of the universe in a new form after its destruction, has no affinity to the doctrine of the resurrection, but is strictly in accordance with the pantheistical views of the Stoics.

to hint in a courteous manner to the apostle that they wished him to close his address, or really expressed a serious intention of hearing him again.* But this result cannot be regarded as any impeachment of the wisdom of the speaker. He could only do his part to prepare his hearers for the new truths he wished to communicate, and, as much as possible, to obtain a favorable hearing. But after all, he could not help giving offence to those who were too much attached to their Hellenic point of view to admit of a susceptibility for anything higher. This could in no way be avoided, or to avoid it he must have refrained from publishing the gospel at all. There were only a few individuals who joined themselves to the apostle, listened to his further instructions, and became believers. Among these was a member of the Areopagite council, Dionysius, who became the subject of so many legends. The only authentic tradition respecting him appears to be, that he was the principal instrument of forming a church at Athens, and became its overseer.†

While Paul was at Athens, Timothy returned from Macedonia,‡ but

* From the silence of the Acts, we are not to infer with certainty that Paul never addressed these persons again.

† See the account of the Bishop Dionysius of Corinth in Eusebius, in his Eccles. Hist. iv. 23. According to some, the name of this Dionysius gave occasion to the whole fabrication of the appearance of Paul on the Areopagus; we recognise in such an opinion the same strange, topsy-turvy criticism, which, instead of finding in the Montanist Paraclete a reference to the gospel of John, would rather find in the gospel of John, as a later piece of patch-work, a reference to the Montanist Paraclete!

‡ On this point there is much uncertainty. According to the Acts, Silas and Timothy first rejoined Paul at Corinth. But 1 Thess. iii. 1, seems to imply the contrary. This passage might indeed be thus understood,—that Paul sent Timothy from Berea before his departure for Athens, to the church in Thessalonica, although he knew that he should now be left in Athens without any companions, for he wished to leave Silas in Berea. Had he departed from Berea alone, however, he would rather have said, “to come to Athens alone,” *ἔρχεσθαι εἰς Ἀθήνας μόνοι*. But this he could not say, since he did not depart to Athens alone, but *with other companions*. Meanwhile the most natural interpretation of the passage is, that Paul, in order to obtain information respecting the Thessalonians, preferred being left alone in Athens, and sent Timothy from that city. Also, in the Acts, xvii. 16, it is implied that he waited at Athens for the return of Silas and Timothy; for though the words, “at Athens,” *ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις*, may be referred, not to “waited,” *ἐκδεχόμενον*, but to the whole clause, still we cannot understand the passage otherwise. If we had merely the account in the Acts, we should be led to the conclusion, by a comparison of xvii. 16, and xviii. 5, that Silas and Timothy were prevented from meeting with Paul at Athens, and they first found him again in Corinth, as he had given them notice that he intended to go thither from Athens. But by comparing it with what Paul himself says, 1 Thess. iii. 1, we must either rectify or fill up the account in the Acts. We learn from it that Timothy at least met with Paul at Athens, but that he thought it necessary to send him from thence to Thessalonica, and that he did not wait for his return from that city to Athens, which may be easily explained. But Luke, perhaps, had not so accurate a knowledge of all the particulars in this period of Paul's history; he had, perhaps, learned only that Paul met again at Corinth with Timothy and Silas, and hence he inferred, as he knew nothing of the sending away of Timothy in the meantime from Athens to Thessalonica, that Paul, after he had parted from his two companions at Berea,

the anxiety of Paul for the new church at Thessalonica induced him to send his young fellow-laborer thither, that he might contribute to the establishment of their faith and their consolation under their manifold sufferings; for Timothy had communicated to him many distressing accounts of the persecutions which had befallen this church.

He travelled alone from Athens, and now visited a place most important for the propagation of the gospel, the city of Corinth, the metropolis of the province of Achaia. This city, within a century and a half after its destruction by Julius Cæsar, once more became the centre of intercourse and traffic to the eastern and western parts of the Roman Empire, for which it was fitted by its natural advantages, namely, by its two noted ports, that of *Kéγχρεαι* towards Lesser Asia, and that of *Αέχαιον* towards Italy. Being thus situated, Corinth became an important position for spreading the gospel in a great part of the Roman Empire, and hence Paul chose it, as he had chosen other cities similarly situated, as a place for a long sojourn. But Christianity had here also, at its first promulgation, peculiar difficulties to combat, and the same causes which hindered its reception at first, threatened at a later period, after it had found entrance, to corrupt its purity, both in doctrine and

rejoined them first at Corinth. As to Silas, it is possible that, on account of the information he brought with him, he was sent back by Paul with a special commission from Athens to Berea, or, what is more probable, that he had occasion to stay longer than Timothy at Berea, and hence could not meet him at Athens. It might also be the case that Luke erroneously concluded, since Silas and Timothy both first met Paul again at Corinth, that he left both at Berea,—possibly that he left only Silas behind and brought Timothy with himself to Athens. It favors, though it does not establish this opinion, that Paul in 1 Thess. iii. 1, alleges as the reason for sending away Timothy, not the unpleasant news brought by Timothy from Macedonia, but the hindrances intervening, which rendered it impossible for him to visit the church in Thessalonica according to his intention. Schneckenburger, in his learned essay on the date of the Epistles to the Thessalonians (in the *Studien der Evangelischen Geistlichkeit Württembergs*, vol. vii. part 1, 1834, p. 139,) (with which in many points I am happy to agree,) maintains that Paul might have charged his two companions to follow him quickly from Berea, because he intended soon to leave Athens, where he expected no suitable soil for his missionary labors. But we have no sufficient reason for supposing this. Paul found at Athens a synagogue for the first scene of his ministry as in other cities; he felt himself compelled, as he says, to publish the gospel to Greeks and to Barbarians; he knew it was the power of God, which would conquer the philosophical blindness of the Greeks as well as the ceremonial blindness of the Jews, though he well knew that on both sides the obstacles were great. At all events, by some not improbable combinations, the narrative in the Acts and the expressions of Paul may easily be reconciled, and we are not therefore justified with Schrader in referring the passage in 1 Thess. iii. 1, to a later residence of Paul at Athens. All the circumstances mentioned seem best to agree with the period of his first visit. Paul having been obliged, contrary to his intention, to leave Thessalonica early, wished on several occasions to revisit it; his anxiety for the new church there was so great that in his tender concern for it, he showed the great sacrifice he was ready to make for it, by saying that he was willing to remain alone at Athens. In later times, when there was a small Christian church at Athens, this would not have been so great a sacrifice.

practice. The two opposite mental tendencies, which at that time especially opposed the spread of Christianity, were, on the one side such an intense devotedness to speculation and the exercise of the intellect to the neglect of all objects of practical interest as threatened to stifle altogether the religious nature of men, that tendency which Paul designates by the phrase "*seeking after wisdom*;" and, on the other side, the sensuous element mingling itself with the exercise of the religious feelings; the carnal mind which would degrade the divine into an object of sensuous experience; that tendency to which Paul applies the phrase, "*seeking after a sign*." The first of these tendencies predominated among the greater number of those persons in Corinth who made pretensions to mental cultivation, for new Corinth was distinguished from the old city, chiefly by becoming, in addition to its commercial celebrity, a seat of literature and philosophy, so that a certain tincture of literary and philosophical culture pervaded the city.* The second of these tendencies was found among the numerous Jews, who were spread through this place of commerce, and entertained the common sensuous conceptions respecting the Messiah. And finally, the spread and efficiency of Christianity was opposed by that gross corruption of morals, which then prevailed in all the great cities of the Roman Empire, but in Corinth was especially promoted by the worship of Aphrodite, to whom a far-famed temple was here erected, which thus consecrated the indulgence of sensuality, favored as it was by the incitements constantly presented in a place of immense wealth and commerce.†

The efficiency of Paul's ministry at Corinth was doubtless much promoted by his meeting with a friend and zealous advocate of the gospel, at whose house he lodged, and with whom he obtained employment for his livelihood, the Jew Aquila from Pontus, who probably had a large manufactory in the same trade by which Paul supported himself. Aquila does not appear to have had a fixed residence at Rome, but to have taken up his abode, at different times, as his business might require, in various large cities situated in the centre of commerce, where he found himself equally at home. But at this time, he was forced to leave Rome against his will, by a mandate of the Emperor Claudius, who found in the restless, turbulent spirit of a number of Jews resident at Rome (the

* In the 2d century, the rhetorician Aristides says of this city: σοφὸν δὲ δὴ καὶ καθ' ὁδὸν ἐλθὼν ἂν εὗροις καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἀψύχων μάθοις ἂν καὶ ἀκούσεις. τοσοῦτοι θησαυροὶ γραμμάτων περὶ πᾶσαν αὐτὴν, ὅποι καὶ μόνον ἀποβλέψει τις, καὶ κατὰ τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτὰς καὶ τὰς στούς· ἐτι τὰ γυμνάσια, τὰ διδασκαλεῖα, καὶ μαθήματά τε καὶ ἱστορήματα. (Even passing along the street you might find a wise man, and hear and learn from inanimate things; so great are the treasures of learning lying all around it, wherever indeed one may but look, even along the thoroughfares and porches; besides there are gymnasia and schools, objects both of science and of research.)—Aristid. in Neptunum, ed. Dindorf, vol. 1, p. 40.

† The rhetorician Dio Chrysostom says to the Corinthians: πόλιν οἰκεῖτε τῶν οὐσῶν τε καὶ γεγεννημένων ἐπαφροδιτοτάτην. (You inhabit a city the most licentious of all that are, or ever have been.) Orat. 37, vol. ii. p. 119, ed. Reiske.

greater part freed-men),* a reason or a pretext for banishing all Jews from that city.†

If Aquila was at that time a Christian, which will easily account for his speedy connexion with Paul, this decree of banishment certainly did not affect him as a Christian, but as classed with the other Jews, in virtue of his Jewish descent, and his participation in all the Jewish religious observances. But if the gospel had already been propagated among the Gentiles at Rome, (which is not probable, for this took place at a later period, by means of Paul's disciples, after his sphere of action had been much extended,) the Gentile Christians, who received the gospel free from Jewish observances, and had not yet attracted notice as a particular sect, would not have been affected by a persecution, which was directed against the Jews, as Jews, on purely political grounds.

* There was a particular quarter on the other side of the Tiber inhabited by Jews. See *Philo-legal. ad Caium*, § 23. τὴν πέραν τοῦ Τιβέρεως ποταμοῦ μεγάλην τῆς Ῥώμης ἀποτόμην κατεχομένην καὶ οἰκουμένην πρὸς Ἰουδαίων. (Across the Tiber a large section of Rome owned and occupied by Jews.)

† The account of Suetonius in the Life of Claudius, c. 25, "Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit," (he expelled from Rome the Jews, who, urged on by Chrestos, were perpetually exciting tumults,) is of little service in historical investigations. Because Suetonius, about fifty years after the event itself, mixed up, in a confused way, what he had heard of Christus as a promoter of sedition among the Jews, with the accounts of the frequent tumults excited among them by expectations of the Messiah, we are not justified in concluding that this banishment of the Jews had any real connexion with Christianity. Dr. Baur, in his essay on the Object and Occasion of the Epistle to the Romans, in the *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*, 1836, part iii. p. 110, thinks, that the disputes between the Jews and Christians in Rome, occasioned the disturbances which at last brought on the expulsion of both parties, and that this is the fact which forms the basis of the account. But disputes among the Jews themselves, whether Jesus was to be acknowledged as the Messiah, would certainly be treated with contempt by the Roman authorities, as mere Jewish religious controversies; see Acts xviii. 15. And if Christians of Gentile descent, who did not observe the Mosaic law, were then living at Rome, these, as a *genus tertium*, would not have been confounded with the Jews, and a decree of banishment directed against the Jews would not have affected them. They only became subject to punishment by the laws against the *religiones peregrinas et novas*. We can only suppose a reference to political disturbances among the Jews, or to occurrences which might have excited suspicions of this kind. This view I must even now, in the fourth edition, maintain in opposition to Dr. Baur, (p. 371.) I must still assert that the disputes which broke out in the Jewish assemblies, whether Jesus was the Messiah, could not have attracted the attention of the Roman authorities, and that their banishment affected not Jews and Christians, but only Jews as Jews.

And this account is of little service in fixing the chronology of the apostolic history, for Suetonius gives no chronological mark. Such a mark would be given, if we connect the banishment of the Jews with the senatus consultum, *de mathematicis Italia pellendis*, for here Tacitus (*Annal.* xii. 52), gives the date Fausto Sulla, Salvio Othone Cons. = A. D. 52. But the chronological connexion of these two events is very uncertain, as they proceeded from different causes. The banishment of the astrologers proceeded from suspicions of conspiracies against the life of the Emperor, with which the banishment of the Jews stood in no sort of connexion, although it might have had its foundation in the dread of political commotions.

We cannot answer with certainty the question, whether Aquila, on his arrival at Corinth, was already a Christian; for it cannot be determined merely from the silence of the Acts, that he was not converted by Paul. In any case, his intercourse with the apostle had great influence in the formation of his Christian views. Aquila appears from this time as a zealous preacher of the gospel, and his various journeys and changes of residence furnished him with many opportunities for acting in this capacity. His wife Priscilla also distinguished herself by her active zeal for the cause of the gospel, so that Paul calls them both, in Rom. xvi. 3, his "*helpers in Christ Jesus*."

We must suppose that the reception given for the most part at Athens to the publication of the gospel, must have left a depressing effect on the mind of the apostle, as far as he was not raised above all depressing considerations by a conviction of the victorious divine power of the gospel. Hence, he himself says, that on his arrival at Corinth, he was at the utmost remove from attaching any importance to anything that human means, human eloquence, and human wisdom, could effect towards procuring an entrance for the publication of the divine word; that he came and taught among them with a deep sense of his human weakness, with fear and trembling as far as his own power was concerned; but at the same time, with so much the greater confidence in the power of God working through his instrumentality. He had experienced at Athens, that it availed him nothing to become a Greek to the Greeks, in his mode of exhibiting divine truth, if the heart was not opened to his preaching by its sense of spiritual need. At Corinth, he was satisfied with the simple annunciation of the Redeemer who died for the salvation of sinful men, without adapting himself, as at Athens, to the taste of the educated classes in his style of address. The greater part indeed of the persons with whom he came in contact at Corinth, were not, as at Athens, people of cultivated minds, but belonging to the lower class, who were destitute of all refinement; for even when Christianity had spread more widely among the higher classes, he could still say, that not many distinguished by human culture or rank were to be found among the Christians, but God had chosen such as were despised by the world, in order to exemplify in them the power of the gospel; 1 Cor. i. 26. Among these people of the lower class, were those who hitherto had been given up to the lusts that prevailed in this sink of moral corruption, but who, by the preaching of the apostle, were awakened to repentance, and experienced in their hearts the power of the announcement of the divine forgiveness of sins; 1 Cor. vi. 11. Paul could indeed appeal to the miracles by which his apostleship had been attested among the Corinthians, 2 Cor. xii. 12; but yet these appeals to the senses were not the means by which the gospel chiefly effected its triumphs at Corinth. As the gospel necessarily appeared as foolishness to the wisdom-seeking Greeks, as long as they persisted in their conceit of wisdom, so also to the sign-seeking Jews, as long as they persisted in their carnal mind, unsusceptible of the

spiritual operations of what was divine, and required miracles cognizable by the senses, the gospel which announced no Messiah performing wonders in the manner their carnal conceptions had anticipated, would always be a stumbling-block. That demonstration which Paul made use of at Corinth, was the same which in all ages has been the firmest support of the gospel, and without which all miracles and all intellectual ability will be in vain, the "*demonstration of the Spirit and of power*," 1 Cor. ii. 4; the demonstration of the indwelling divine power of the gospel on minds rendered susceptible by the feeling of moral need; the demonstration arising from the power with which the gospel operates on that principle in human nature, which is allied to God but depressed by the principle of sin. Thus the sign-seeking Jews who attained to faith, found in the gospel a "power of God" superior to all external miracles, and the believers among the wisdom-seeking Greeks found a divine wisdom, compared with which all the wisdom of their philosophers appeared as nothing.

As was usual, Paul was obliged by the hostile disposition with which the greater part of the Jews received his preaching in the synagogue, to direct his labors to the Gentiles through the medium of the Proselytes, and the new church was mostly formed of Gentiles, to whom a small number of Jews joined themselves. That he might devote all his time and strength without distraction to preaching, he soon organized the small company of believers into a regular church, and left the baptism of those who were brought to the faith by his preaching, to be administered by those who were chosen to fill the offices in the church; 1 Cor. i. 16; xvi. 15.

In the mean time, the acceptance which the gospel here found among the heathen, powerfully excited the rage of the Jews, and they availed themselves of the arrival of the new Proconsul Annæus Gallio, a brother of Seneca the philosopher, to arraign Paul before his tribunal. Since, by the laws of the empire, the right was secured to them of practising their own religious institutions without molestation, they inferred, that whoever caused division among them by the propagation of doctrines opposed to their own principles, encroached on the enjoyment of their privileges, and was amenable to punishment. But the Proconsul, a man of mild disposition,* showed no desire to involve himself in the internal religious controversies of the Jews, which must have appeared to a Roman statesman as idle disputes about words; and the Gentiles themselves, on this occasion, testified their disapprobation of the accusers. The frustration of this attempt against the apostle enabled him to continue his labors with less annoyance in this region, so that their influence was felt through the whole province of Achaia, (1 Thess. i. 7, 8; 2 Cor. i. 1,) whether he made use of his disciples as instruments, or suspended his residence at

* Known by the name of the *dulcis Gallio*. Seneca, Præfat. Natural. quest. iv. "Nemo mortalium uni tam dulcis est, quam hic omnibus." (No one among mortals is so gracious to one, as he, to everybody.)

Corinth, by a journey into other parts of the province, and then returned again to the principal scene of his ministry.*

When he had been laboring for some time in these parts, he received from Timothy, now returned from Thessalonica, accounts of the state of the church there, which were far from pleasing in every respect. The faith of the church had indeed been steadfast under its persecutions, and their example and zeal had promoted the further spread of the gospel in Macedonia, even to Achaia, but there were many who had not been preserved pure from the corruption of heathen immorality. The expectation† of Christ's reappearance had taken in the minds of many a fanatical direction, so that they neglected their stated employments, and expected to be maintained at the expense of their more opulent brethren. Prophets rose up in their assemblies, whose addresses contained much that was fanatical; while others, who were on their guard against these extravagant exhibitions, went so far in an opposite direction as to put in the same class the manifestations of a genuine inspiration. Probably from a fear of undue religious excitement, they could not endure that any person, though he felt himself inwardly called, should give free utterance to his sentiments in the meetings of the church; for to this Paul's exhortation appears to refer, in 1 Thess. v. 19, "Quench not the Spirit." On all these accounts, he considered it necessary to address an epistle of encouragement and exhortation to this church.‡

* See 2 Thess. i. 4, where Paul, in an epistle written during the latter part of his residence at Corinth, says, that in several churches, and therefore not merely in the Corinthian, he had spoken with praise of the faith and zeal of the Thessalonian church.

† The passages in the First Epistle to the Thessalonians that relate to the expectation of Christ's second coming, have altogether the impress of this first age, looking forward with ardent longing to his speedy return. Only in this first period could such exhibitions of fanatical excitement, as were actually witnessed in the church at Thessalonica in connexion with this expectation, have made their appearance. Only then could the apprehension have arisen, that those who were "asleep" (1 Thess. iv. 13) would be far surpassed in privilege by those still living, who should be witnesses of Christ's second advent. Any one, at a later period, writing such an epistle under Paul's name, would certainly not have encouraged the expectation of Christ's advent being so near—an expectation which would have already been corrected by the intervening period. He would rather have had a special interest to admonish them, not to expect his coming too soon, that they might not be mistaken if it were postponed to a later period. The manner in which the second advent of Christ is spoken of in this epistle, instead of being, as Baur imagines, a mark of its spuriousness, is rather the surest and most palpable proof that it could have been written at no other period.

‡ In this epistle, he evidently assumes, that the manner of his coming from Philippi to Thessalonica was still fresh in the remembrance of the church, so that he alludes to only one residence among them, after his arrival from Philippi. What Paul says in 1 Thess. i. 9, he could only say at a period which was shortly subsequent to his departure from Thessalonica. Hence, it is certain, that the epistle was written at that juncture, and that it is the first among the Pauline epistles which have reached us, an opinion, with which its whole complexion well agrees. The reasons against this view, maintained by Schirader, some of which we have mentioned and endeavored to refute, are not convincing. The

In his epistle, he reminds the church of the manner in which he conducted himself among them, the example of manual industry which he set, and the exhortations which he addressed to them.* He calmed their anxiety respecting the fate of those who had died during this period. He warned them against making attempts to determine the time of the second coming of Christ. That critical moment would come unexpectedly; the exact time could be ascertained by no one; but it was the duty of Christians to be always prepared for it. They were not to walk in darkness, lest that day should overtake them as a thief in the night; as children of the light, they ought to walk continually in the light and the day; and to watch over themselves, that they might meet the appearance of the Lord with confidence.†

anxiety of many persons in reference to their deceased friends (iv. 13,) proves indeed, that some of the first Christians at Thessalonica had already died, but certainly does not justify the conclusion, that the church must have already existed a long time; for within a comparatively short time, many, especially those who were in years or in declining health at their conversion, might have died. Also the argument, that Paul, in this epistle, supposes the existence of a church organized in the usual manner with Presbyters, will prove nothing against the early composition of this epistle. For why should not Paul have accomplished all this during his short stay at Thessalonica, or put matters in a train for its being done soon after his departure? It is evident from Acts xiv. 23, how important he deemed it to give the usual constitution to the churches as they were forming; and this must have been more especially the case with a church which he left in such critical circumstances, even apart from persecutors. It is true, if the rule laid down in the First Epistle to Timothy, that no novice in Christianity should be chosen to the office of presbyter, had been from the beginning an invariable principle, we might conclude, that so new a church, which must consist entirely of novices, could have no presbytery. But there is nothing to support this conclusion, and the circumstances of the primitive apostolic age are against it. The rules given in that epistle, as well as many other things in it, indicate that it was written in the latter part of Paul's life, and in reference to a church not newly organized. And what we find in Philip. iv. 16, by no means obliges us to assume a second visit of Paul to Thessalonica, after which both epistles were written. He there says, that during the time of the first publication of the gospel among the heathen, (which cannot be referred to a later period,) when he left Macedonia, no church excepting that at Philippi had sent him a contribution—first, when he was in Thessalonica before he left Macedonia, and then once or twice at Corinth, during his longer sojourn there. 2 Cor. xi. 9.

* All this must certainly give the impression of a person who writes from the fresh lively recollection of his own recent experiences; and not the impression of a designed recapitulation made up so as to accord with the Acts and the Pauline epistles, a mark of spuriousness which Baur is disposed to find, p. 481.

† What Baur says against the genuineness of the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, which bears on the face of it so decidedly a Pauline impress, shows us how hard it is to satisfy these modern critics. If expressions similar to those in the other Pauline epistles occur, they must have been borrowed from them. On the contrary, if there are turns of expression which do not occur in the other Pauline epistles, it is an indubitable sign of an un-Pauline origin. But one would suppose that the conjunction of what is allied to the Pauline epistles, with other things which are not elsewhere found just so expressed by Paul, provided there be nothing evidently at variance with the Pauline characteristics, would be rather an evidence of genuineness; for an individual who had the Pauline epi-

As this epistle contained so many peculiarly important lessons, exhortations, and warnings for different members of the church, Paul must have been earnestly desirous that it should be read by all. Whether he wished it to be read before all at their public meetings, or that all should have an opportunity of reading it privately, cannot be determined precisely from the words* in ch. v. 27.†

tles before him, and wished to write another after them in Paul's name, would have shown himself as more of a slavish imitator. Baur finds something thoroughly un-Pauline in the circumstance that the churches in Judea are presented as a pattern to the Gentile Christians; especially since Paul could not have spoken of those persecutions without referring to himself as a chief partaker in the only ones which could here have been taken into consideration. So moreover, that extreme general hostile tone towards the Jews, which alludes to the *odium generis humani* cast upon the Jews, appears to Baur altogether un-Pauline. But if this had been interpolated by another person, it would be difficult to reconcile his being so hostilely disposed towards the Jews with his pointing out the churches in Judea as patterns for imitation. Only in a spirit so original and unfettered as Paul's could both meet together. Now, the persecutions which the Christians in Judea had suffered at various times, and of which he might have been in part an eye-witness on his first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion, he held in fresh and lively remembrance. In this respect he could name no Gentile church as an object of imitation. How natural that he should here name the parent church, animated as he always was with the conviction that believing Jews and Gentiles were to be bound together in one Christian community! The recollection that at an earlier period he had been so violent a persecutor of the Christians, could least of all prevent his so expressing himself; for, as he says, he had since been made a new creature, and all things had become new. Nor do I know how Paul could have delineated more strikingly, the ungodliness, the inhumanity, and the envy of the Jews towards the Gentiles, of which in just his last missionary journey he had had such frequent experience. The passage in which he represents the believers among the Gentiles as imitators of the primitive church in Judea, was a natural occasion for mentioning that the same Jews had killed Jesus and the prophets, and had everywhere persecuted himself as a witness of the Christian truth by which the Gentiles also would partake of salvation. In the accidentally chosen expression *ἐκδιωξάντων* may be traced the fresh recollection that he had been driven out from the cities where he preached the gospel, through the influence of the Jews who had instigated the Gentiles. At a later period, when Paul was brought more into collision with Jewish Christians than with Jews simply, he had less occasion for so expressing himself. Criticism ought not merely to consider the Pauline epistles as a whole, but study them chronologically, and carefully distinguish the various stages of Paul's literary activity. In reference to peculiarities of style, turns of thought, and development of doctrine, a difference in them will indeed be perceptible, and it will be seen that the Epistles to the Thessalonians have exactly those characteristics which belong to the first stage, while his other epistles of which the genuineness has been disputed, have, on the contrary, the characteristic peculiarities of the last stage.

* See also Coloss. iv. 16.

† This wish appears perfectly natural on the first occasion of writing to them, as in every letter which is intended to meet the wants of many members in a community, and I do not see in it the marks of an importance attributed to letter-writing not suitable to the times, nor with what propriety Baur could say that "this must have been written according to the views of an age which did not see in the letters of the apostle the natural medium of mental intercourse, but a sanctuary to be approached with all due reverence, so that their contents were to be known as accurately as possible, particularly by means of

After a time, Paul learned that the epistle had not attained its end ; that the enthusiastic tendency in the Thessalonian church had continued to increase. In his former epistle, he had considered it necessary to guard them against both extremes ; to warn them against the entire suppression of free prophetic addresses, as well as against receiving every thing as divine which pretended to be so, without examination. The higher life was to be developed and expressed freely without harassing restrictions ; but all claims to inspiration ought to be submitted to sober examination.* He must, therefore, have had cause to suspect danger from this quarter, even had he not received more exact information. But he was subsequently informed, that persons had come forward in the church who professed to have received revelations to the effect that the appearance of the Lord was close at hand. They also endeavored to strengthen their assertions by distorting certain expressions of the apostle, which he had used during his residence at Thessalonica. But now since the epistle of Paul was so plainly opposed to the enthusiastic tendency which aimed at fixing the exact time of Christ's second coming, one of the promoters of this error ventured so far as to forge another epistle in Paul's name, which might serve to confirm this expectation, in which probably he took advantage of the circumstance, that the apostle in his first epistle had satisfied himself with urging what was of practical importance without giving a decided opinion on the nearness or remoteness of that great event.† Such forgeries were not at all uncom-

public reading," &c. This is indeed "not seeing the woods on account of the trees!" How naturally the words in ch. v. 27, are connected with the preceding request "to greet all the brethren!"

* It appears to me that 1 Thess. v. 21, altogether relates to what immediately precedes — "prove all things in the communications of the prophets, and retain whatever is good ;" but in verse 22, he makes a transition to a general remark, "that they should keep themselves at a distance from every kind of evil," with which his prayer for the sanctification of the whole man (v. 23) naturally connects itself.

† The passage in 2 Thess. ii. 2, might, it is true, be understood, as if only the statements in the first epistle had been misrepresented ; and it is certainly possible to imagine, that they had misapplied Paul's comparison of a thief in the night, as if he expected the appearance of Christ to be an event close at hand, and only meant to say that the point of time could not be given more distinctly. But these words of Paul, however, would be more naturally understood of the forgery of a letter in his name, and the manner in which he guards against similar forgeries, by a postscript in his own hand, favors this opinion. I cannot perceive the justness of Baur's remark, p. 49, "How could Paul rationally attach any weight to such a criterion of the genuineness of his epistle, which as soon as it was once known to be such, would be used so much the more for the purposes of forgery?" Paul's Greek writing was probably not so easy to be imitated. Nor in the words *πάντη ἐπιστολῇ* (iii. 17) can I find, with Baur, a mark of spuriousness. It by no means follows, that the author gave a false explanation of Paul's custom to add something in his own handwriting to his epistles. If Paul had elsewhere added such closing words in autograph to testify his love to the church, yet he might have been led by the peculiar circumstances of this church to make use of them here as a criterion of its being his genuine epistle. Or he might first of all have been led with this view to make such a

mon in this century after the beginning of the Alexandrian period of literature, and their authors were very adroit in justifying such deceptions for the purpose of giving currency to certain principles and opinions.* That something of this kind happened so early in the church at Thessalonica, while on the other hand we find no trace of it in the later epistles of Paul, is explained by the peculiar circumstances of that church, the excited state of its members, that one-sidedness of the Christian spirit which directed its attention only to the future, that limitation of mental vision which did not take in the whole of Christianity, but gazed alone on the second advent. Such a one-sided religious interest might easily be seduced to call all means good which would gratify its indulgence. In later times Paul had far more to do with adversaries who disputed his apostolic authority than with false friends who sought to avail themselves of it for their own ends. His later false adherents were more sober, and free from the enthusiastic tendency of the Thessalonians. Thus everything is explained by a perfectly consistent and genuine historical impress, bearing marks of the peculiar circumstances of this church. What purpose would it serve the author of a forged epistle to warn them of other epistles also forged in Paul's name? This morbid tendency also operated injuriously in producing idleness, and a neglect of a person's own affairs, united with a prying, intermeddling curiosity respecting the concerns of others. Paul, therefore, thought it necessary to write a second epistle to Thessalonica.† In this epistle, for the purpose of guarding them against the expectation of an immediate approach of that last decisive period, he directed their attention to the signs of the times which would precede it. The revelation of the evil that opposed itself to the kingdom of God, a self-idolatry excluding the worship of the living God, would first reach its utmost limit. Delusive errors, by a hypocritical show of godliness, and by extraordinary powers, apparently miraculous, would deceive those who had not followed the simple, unadulterated truth. The rejection of the True and the Divine would be punished by a subjection to falsehood. Those persons would be ensnared by the arts of deception, who, because they had suppressed the sense of truth in their hearts, deserved to be deceived,

closing addition, and afterwards, when this view had been lost sight of, still on other accounts to have retained the practice. But he must have foreseen that he would have occasion to write several other letters to the churches. We are not at all justified in asserting that the greatest part of Paul's correspondence has been handed down to us.

* The Bishop Dionysius very much lamented the falsification of letters which he had written to various churches. Euseb. iv. 23.

† He had at that time travelled from Corinth to Achaia, and founded other churches. Already he had sustained many conflicts with the enemies of the gospel; he had occasion to request the intercessory prayers of the churches, that he might be delivered from the machinations of evil-minded men; for such were not wanting, who were unsuspicious of receiving the gospel; 2 Thess. iii. 2. This reminds us of the above-mentioned accusations made by the Jews against Paul.

and by their own criminality had prepared themselves for all the deceptions of falsehood. Then would Christ appear, in order by his victorious divine power to destroy the kingdom of evil after it had attained its widest extension, and to consummate the kingdom of God. As signs similar to those which prognosticate the last decisive and most triumphant epoch, are repeated in all the great epochs of the kingdom of God, as it advances victoriously in conflict with the kingdom of evil, Paul might believe that he recognised in many signs of *his own* time, the commencement of the final epoch. By the light of the divine Spirit, and according to the intimations of Christ* himself, he discerned the general law of the development of the kingdom of Christ, which is applicable to all the great epochs down to the very last,† but he was not aware that similar phenomena must often recur until the arrival of the final crisis.‡

Thus Paul labored during another half-year for the spread of Christianity in these parts, and then concluded that second period of his ministry among the heathen which began with the second missionary journey. We are now arrived at a resting-place, from which we shall proceed to a new period in his ministry, and in the history of the propagation of the gospel among the Gentiles.

* See Life of Christ, pp. 317, 367.

† But in the signs of this last epoch which are specially noticed in this epistle, we find proofs of their proceeding from this period of the apostolic age, rather than from a later time. At a later period, the specification of heresies as omens of the approach of Antichrist would certainly not have been wanting.

‡ When persons have attempted to determine with exactness the signs of the times given by Paul, they have failed in many points. In the first place, they have sought, in later ages, for the appearances which the apostle specifies, while he refers to appearances in his own age, or to those which they seemed to forbode. In other important periods, which preceded remarkable epochs for the development of the kingdom of Christ, signs might be found indeed, similar to those which Paul has here described. Still we should not be justified in saying that these signs in this particular form were consciously present to Paul's mind. And thus we should fall into error, if, in a one-sided way, we expected to find what is anti-Christian only in manifestations of one special kind in the history of the church, instead of recognising a Christian truth lying at the basis of such manifestations and finding in other appearances also the same anti-Christian spirit by which the Christian principle was here disturbed, and at last wholly obscured. When too, these signs have been looked for in the actual situation of the apostle, the defectiveness of our knowledge of his situation, and of the peculiar views of his times, has been forgotten. Or instead of estimating the great views respecting the development of the kingdom of God, which the apostle here unfolds, according to their essential ideas, the kernel has been thrown away, and the shell retained, and they have been compared with the Jewish fables respecting Antichrist.

CHAPTER VII.

THE APOSTLE PAUL'S JOURNEY TO ANTIOCH, AND HIS RENEWED MISSIONARY LABORS AMONG THE HEATHEN.

AFTER Paul had labored during another half-year for the establishment of the Christian church in Corinth and Achaia, he resolved, before attempting to form new churches among the heathen, to visit once more that city which had been hitherto the metropolis of the Christian-Gentile world, Antioch, where possibly he had arranged a meeting with other publishers of the gospel. This was no doubt the principal, but probably not the only object of his journey. He felt it to be very important to prevent the outbreak of a division between the Jewish and the Gentile Christians, and to take away from the Jews and Jewish Christians every even apparent ground for their accusation, that he was an enemy of their nation and of the religion of their fathers. On this account, he resolved to revisit at the same time the metropolis of Judaism, in order publicly to express his gratitude to the God of his fathers in the temple at Jerusalem,* according to a form much approved by the Jews, and thus practically to refute these imputations. There was at that time among the Jews a religious custom, arising most probably from a modification of the Nazarite vow, for those who had been visited with sickness or any other great calamity to vow, that if they were restored, they would bring a thank-offering to Jehovah in the temple, would abstain from wine for thirty days, and would shave their heads.† Paul had

* If it had been of so much importance to the author of the Acts for his apologetical or conciliatory purpose, as Baur maintains, to notice Paul's journeys to the feasts at Jerusalem, why should he allude so slightly to the journey of which we are here speaking, (xviii. 18, 22,) so that it has given occasion to moot the question, whether he actually visited Jerusalem at that time? Here, certainly, nothing is less shown than such a purpose. Baur assumes, (p. 194,) that the words which are favorable to his opinion (xviii. 21,) are decidedly genuine, though, to say the least, they are very suspicious. But these words, even admitting them to be genuine, by no means prove such a purpose in the Acts, and contain nothing irreconcilable with the Pauline point of view: for all turns upon the question, *how* the necessity he speaks of is to be understood? and of this nothing more is said.

† Josephus, de Bello Jud. ii. 15, τοὺς γὰρ ἢ νόσω καταπονουμένους ἢ τισιν ἄλλαις ἀνάγκαις ἔθος εὐχεσθαι πρὸς λ' ἡμερῶν, ἧς ἀποδώσειν μέλλοιεν θυσίας, οἶνον τε ἀφέξεσθαι καὶ ξυρῆσασθαι τὰς κόμας. It appears to me quite necessary to change the aorist in the last clause into the future *ξυρήσεσθαι*; and I would translate the passage thus—"they were accustomed to vow that they would refrain from wine and shave their hair thirty days before the presentation of the offering." From comparing this with the Nazarite vow, we might indeed conclude that the shaving of the hair took place at the end of thirty days, as Meyer thinks in his commentary; but the words of Josephus do not agree with this supposition, for we cannot be allowed to interpolate another period before the *ξυρήσεσθαι*, "and at the end of these thirty days." Also what follows in Josephus is opposed to it, and Paul's shaving his hair several weeks before his arrival at Jerusalem, will not harmonize with such a supposition.

probably resolved, on the occasion of his deliverance from some danger during his last residence at Corinth, or on his journey from that city,* publicly to express his grateful acknowledgments in the temple at Jerusalem. The form of his doing this was in itself a matter of indifference, and in the spirit of Christian wisdom, he felt no scruple to become in respect of form, to the Jews a Jew, or to the Gentiles a Gentile. When he was on the point of sailing with Aquila to Lesser Asia from Cenchræa, he began the fulfilment of his vow.† He left his companion with his wife behind at Ephesus, whither he promised to return, and hastened to Jerusalem, where he visited the church, and presented his offering in the temple.‡ He then travelled to Antioch, where he stayed a long

* From how many dangers he was rescued, and how much would be required to complete the narrative given in the Acts, we learn from 2 Cor. xi. 26, 27.

† Unnecessary difficulties have been raised respecting Acts xviii. 18. Paul, in the 18th verse, and in those immediately following, is the only subject; and the words relating to Aquila and Priscilla are merely parenthetical. All that is here said must therefore be referred to Paul and not to Aquila, who is mentioned only incidentally. Schneckenburger, in his work on the Acts, p. 66, finds a reason for mentioning such an unimportant circumstance respecting a subordinate person in this, that a short notice of a man, who for half a year lived in the same house as Paul, would serve as an indirect justification of the apostle against the accusations of his Judaizing opponents: but this is connected with the whole hypothesis, of which, for reasons already given, I cannot approve. Besides, Aquila could not have taken *such* a vow, because he did not travel to Jerusalem, where the offering must be presented. It might, therefore, be supposed that he had made a vow of another kind, that he would not allow his hair to be cut till he had left Corinth in safety, like the Jews who bound themselves by a vow to do or not to do something, as, for example, not to take food till they had accomplished what they wished; compare Acts xxiii. 14, and the legends from the *Εὐαγγέλιον καθ' Ἑβραίων*, in Jerome de v. i. c. ii. But such unmeaning folly no one can attribute to Aquila. And Luke would hardly have related any thing so insignificant of Aquila, who was not the hero of his narrative. But Meyer thinks he has found a special proof that this relates not to Paul but to Aquila, because, in Acts xviii. 18, the name of Priscilla is mentioned, not as it is in v. 2 and 26, and contrary to the usage of antiquity, with a design to make the reference to Aquila more pointed. We might allow some weight to this consideration, if we did not find the same arrangement of the names in Rom. xvi. 3, and 2 Tim. iv. 19. We shall find a common ground of explanation for what appears a striking deviation from the customs of antiquity in the fact, that although Priscilla was not a public instructress, which would have been contrary to the laws of the church, yet she was distinguished even more than her husband for her Christian knowledge, and her zeal for the promotion of the kingdom of God; that in this respect Paul stood in a more intimate relation, a closer alliance of spirit to her, as Bleek has suggested in his Introduction to the Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 422. And thus we find in this undesigned departure from the prevailing usage, on a point so unimportant in itself, an indication of the higher dignity conferred so directly by Christianity on the female sex.

‡ The words in Acts xviii. 21, cannot prove that Paul travelled to Jerusalem, for the original expression only makes it highly probable; "I will return to you again, God willing;" and all the rest is only a gloss. If, therefore, we do not find the journey to Jerusalem indicated in the "gone up," *ἀναβὰς*, and "went down," *κατέβη*, of v. 22, we must assume that Paul on this journey came only as far as Antioch, and not to Jerusalem, and then the interpretation of Acts xviii. 18, given in the text, must be abandoned. It is also remarkable that Luke, in referring to Paul's sojourn at Jerusalem, should mention only his

time, and met with Barnabas, and other friends and former associates in publishing the gospel. The apostle Peter also joined the company of preachers of the gospel here assembled:—Jewish and heathen Christians, and apostles of the Jews and of the Gentiles, united in true Christian fellowship with one another, in accordance with the spirit of the resolutions adopted by the council at Jerusalem.

But this beautiful unanimity was disturbed by certain Judaizing zealots, who came from Jerusalem probably with an evil design, since what they had heard of the free publication of the gospel among the heathen was offensive to their contracted feelings. For a considerable time the pharisaically-minded Jewish Christians appeared to have been silenced by the apostolic decisions, but they could not be induced to give up their opposition, so closely connected with their narrow, exclusively Jewish mode of thinking, to a completely free and independent gospel. The constant enlargement of Paul's sphere of labor among the heathen, of which they became more fully aware by his journeys to Jerusalem and Antioch, excited afresh their suspicion and jealousy. Though they professed to be delegates sent by James from Jerusalem,* it by no means follows that they were justified in so doing; for before this time such Judaizers had falsely assumed a similar character. These persons were disposed not to acknowledge the uncircumcised Gentile Christians, who observed no part of the Mosaic ceremonial law, as genuine Christian brethren, as brethren in the faith, endowed with privileges equal to their own in the kingdom of the Messiah. Since they looked upon them as still unclean, they refused to eat with them. The same Peter who had at first asserted so emphatically the equal rights of the Gentile Christians, and afterwards at the last apostolic convention had so strenuously defended them, now allowed himself to be carried away by a regard to his countrymen, and for the moment was faithless to his principles. We here recognise the old nature of Peter, which, though conquered by the spirit of the gospel, was still active, and on some occasions regained the ascendancy—the same Peter who, after he had borne the most impressive testimony to the

saluting the church, and say nothing of the presentation of his offering at the temple; and that James, who afterwards, on Paul's last visit to Jerusalem, advised him to a similar line of conduct, should not have appealed to the example now given of his accommodation to the feelings of the Jews. But Luke is never to be regarded as the author of a history complete in all its parts, but simply as a writer who, without historical art, put together what he heard and saw, or what became known to him by the reports of others. Hence he narrates several less important circumstances, and passes over those which would be more important for maintaining the connexion of the history. Also, to a reader familiar with Jewish customs, it might be sufficiently clear that Paul, according to what is mentioned in xviii. 18, must have brought an offering to Jerusalem. At all events, if we wish to refer v. 22 only to Cæsarea, the ἀναβὰς must be superfluous, and the κατέβη would not suit the geographical relation of Cæsarea to Antioch.

* This is not necessarily contained in the words, "certain ones from James," *τινὲς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου*, which may simply mean that these persons belonged to the church at Jerusalem, over which James presided.

Redeemer, at the sight of danger for an instant denied him. The example of an apostle whose character stood so high, influenced other Christians of Jewish descent, so that even Barnabas ceased to hold intercourse with Gentile Christians. Paul, who condemned what was evil, without respect to persons, called it an act of hypocrisy. He alone remained faithful to his principles, and in the presence of all administered a severe reprimand to Peter, and laid open the inconsistency of his conduct. "Why, if thou thyself," he said, "although thou art a Jew, hast no scruple to live as a Gentile with the Gentiles, why wilt thou force the Gentiles to become Jews? We are born Jews—we, if the Jews are right in their pretensions, were not sinners like the Gentiles, but clean and holy as born citizens of the theocratic nation. But by our own course of conduct, we express our contrary conviction. With all our observance of the law, we have acknowledged ourselves to be sinners who are in need of justification as well as others, well knowing that by works, such as the law is able to produce,* no man can be justified before God; but justification can only be attained by faith in Christ, and having been convinced of this, we have sought it by him alone. But this conviction we contradict, if we seek again for justification by the works of the law. We, therefore, present ourselves again as sinners † needing justification; and Christ, instead of justifying us from sin, has deprived us of the only means of justification, and led us into sin, if it be sin to consider ourselves freed from the law. Far be this from us." ‡

* We may here notice briefly what will be more fully developed when we come to treat of the Apostolic Doctrine, that Paul by *ἐργοῖς νόμου* understands works which a compulsory, threatening law may force a man to perform in the absence of a holy disposition. The idea comprehends the mere outward fulfilling of the law, and has reference to the moral as well as ritual law. Both these, which are so closely connected in Judaism, maintain their real importance only as an expression of the truly pious disposition of *δικαιοσύνη*. Reference to the moral or the ritual law predominates only according to the varied antithesis of idea. In this passage a special reference is made to the ritual.

† The words, Gal. ii. 18, "If what I have destroyed (the Mosaic law) I build up again (like Peter, who had practically testified again to the universal obligation of the Mosaic law) I must look upon myself as a transgressor of the law, as a sinner." (Paul here supposes Peter to express the conviction that he had done wrong in departing from the law; that he was guilty of transgressing a law that was still binding.) I cannot perfectly agree with Rückert's exposition, which makes these words to be used by Paul in reference to himself. For this general proposition would not be correct, "Whoever builds up again what he has pulled down pursues a wrong course." If he had done wrong in pulling down, he would do right in building up what had been pulled down; and even the opponents of Paul maintained the first, they could not, therefore, be affected by that proposition, and the logical Paul would have taken good care not to express it.

‡ Paul's reprimand of Peter (Gal. ii.) appears to reach only as far as the eighteenth verse, excl. What follows, by the transition from the plural to the singular, and by the "for" γὰρ, is shown to be a commentary by Paul on some expressions, which, uttered in the warmth of feeling, might be somewhat obscure, and is evidently not a continuation of his address. As to the date of this interview with Peter, we readily allow that we cannot attain to absolute certainty. Paul himself narrates the occurrence immediately after speaking of *that* journey to Jerusalem, which we found reasons for considering as his

If we fix this controversy of Paul and Peter,* which as the following history shows, produced no permanent separation between them, exactly at this period, it will throw much light on the connexion of events. Till now the pacification concluded at Jerusalem between the Jewish and Gentile Christians had been maintained inviolate. Till now Paul had had to contend only with Jewish opponents, not with Judaizers, in the churches of Gentile Christians; but now the opposition between the Jewish and Gentile Christians, which the apostolic resolutions had repressed, again made its appearance. As in this capital of Gentile Christianity, which formed the central point of Christian missions, the controversy first arose, so exactly in the same spot it broke forth afresh, notwithstanding the measures taken by the apostles to settle it; and having once been renewed, it spread itself through all the churches where there was a mixture of Jews and Gentiles. Here Paul had first to combat that party, whose agents afterwards persecuted him in every scene of his labors. It might at first appear strange that this division should break out exactly at that time; at the very time when the manner in which Paul had just appeared at Jerusalem, having become to the Jews a Jew, might have served to make a more favorable impression on the minds of those Christians who were still attached to Judaism. But although it might thus operate on the more moderate among them, yet the event showed that, on the fanatical zealots, whose principles were too antagonistic to admit of their being reconciled to him, it produced quite

third. And accordingly, we might suppose that this event followed the apostolic convention at Jerusalem. And certainly many persons might have been induced, by the report of what had taken place among the Gentile Christians (which to Jewish Christians must have appeared so very extraordinary), to resort to the assembly of the Gentile Christians at Antioch, partly to be witnesses of the novel transactions, and partly out of suspicion. According to what we have before remarked, it is not impossible that these Judaizers, soon after the resolutions for acknowledging the equal rights of Gentile Christians were passed, became unfaithful to them, because they explained them differently from their original intention. But there is greater probability that these events did not immediately succeed the issuing of those resolutions. It is by no means evident that Paul, in this passage of the Epistle to the Galatians, intended to observe chronological exactness. He rather appears to be speaking of an event which was quite fresh in his memory, and had happened only a short time before. Besides the two suppositions here mentioned, a third is possible, which has been advocated by Hug and Sneckenburger; namely, that this event took place *before* the apostolic convention. But though Paul here follows no strict chronological order, yet it is difficult to believe that he would not place the narrative of an event, so closely connected with the controversies which gave occasion to his conferences with the apostles at Jerusalem, at the beginning, instead of letting it follow as supplementary.

* Confessedly a mistaken reverence for the apostle led many persons in the ancient (especially the eastern) church to a very unnatural view of this controversy. In order that no fault might be found with Peter's course, they adopted the notion that Peter and Paul had an understanding with one another; that both—the one for the advantage of the Jews, the other for the advantage of the Gentile Christians—committed an *officiosum mendacium*. Augustin, in his Epistle to Jerome, and in his book *De Mendacio*, has admirably combated this prejudice, and the false interpretation founded upon it.

an opposite effect. The man who had spoken so freely of the law, who had always so strenuously maintained the equal rank of the uncircumcised Gentile Christians with the Jewish Christians, who had been condemned by them as a despiser of the law, this man, they thought, had no right to represent himself as one of the believing Jewish people. They well knew how to make use of what he had done at Jerusalem to his disadvantage; and by representing his actions in a false light, they accused him of inconsistency, and of artfully attempting to flatter the Gentile Christians.

The influence of this party soon extended itself through the churches in Galatia and Achaia. It is true that Paul, when, after leaving his friends at Antioch, he visited once more the churches in Phrygia and Galatia on his way to Ephesus, whither he had promised to come on his return, observed no striking change among them.* But still, he re-

* He expresses to the Galatian churches his astonishment that they had deserted, so soon after his departure, the evangelical doctrine for which they had before shown so much zeal, Gal. i. 6. As several modern writers (particularly Rückert) have maintained it as beyond dispute, that Paul, during his second residence among the Galatian churches, had to oppose their tendency to Judaism, we must examine more closely the grounds of this assertion. As to Gal. i. 9, I cannot acknowledge as decisive the reason alleged by Rückert, Usteri, and Schott, against these words being an impassioned asseveration of the sentiment in the preceding verse, and therefore of their relating to what he had said when last with them. Why might it not be a reference to what was written before, like Eph. iii. 3; 2 Cor. vii. 2? For that what he refers to in both these passages is rather more distant, makes no difference in the form of the expression. But if these words must refer to something said by Paul at an earlier period, yet the consequence which Rückert believes may be drawn from them, does not follow; for though Paul had no cause to be dissatisfied with the church itself, yet after what he had experienced at Antioch, added to the earlier leaning of a part of the church to Judaism, he might have considered it necessary to charge it upon them most impressively, that under whatever name, however revered, another doctrine might be announced to them, than that which he had preached, it would deserve no credit, but must be anti-Christian. Although Gal. v. 21 certainly refers to something said by the apostle at an earlier period, yet nothing further can be concluded from it; for in every church he must have held it very necessary to make it apparent that men would only grossly flatter themselves if they imagined that they could enter the kingdom of heaven without a complete change of heart and conduct, 1 Thess. iv. 6. Eph. v. 5, 6. The words in Gal. v. 2, 3 must be thus understood, "As I said, that whoever allows himself to be circumcised, renounces his fellowship with Christ, so I testify to such an one again, that he is bound to fulfil the whole law." Evidently, the second and third verses relate to one another; the thoughts are correlative. If Paul intended to remind the Galatians of warnings he had given them by word of mouth, why did he not insert the *πάλιν* in verse 2, since what is there expressed forms the leading thought, and requires the strongest emphasis to be laid upon it? Nor in the fact, that without any preparation, as in his other epistles, he opens this with such vehement rebuke, can I with Rückert find a proof that during his former residence among these churches he had detected the Judaizing tendency among them, and was forced to involve them all in blame, in order to bring them back to the right path. This very peculiarity in the tone with which the epistle begins may be easily explained, if we suppose that having during his visit perceived no departure from the doctrine announced to them, and having warned them beforehand of the artifices of the Judaizers, the sudden information of the effect produced among them

marked, that these Judaizing teachers sought to gain an entrance into the churches, that they affected great zeal for their spiritual welfare—for the attainment of the Gentiles to the full enjoyment of the privileges and benefits of the Messiah's kingdom; and that they strove to imbue them with the false notion, that unless they allowed themselves to be circumcised, they could not stand on a level with the Jewish Christians. Still he had cause to be satisfied with the manner in which they maintained their Christian freedom against these persons, Gal. iv. 18. And he sought only to confirm them still more in this Christian mode of thinking and acting, while he endeavored to impress on their hearts afresh the lesson that, independently of any legal observance, salvation could be obtained only by faith in Christ, and earnestly put them on their guard against everything which opposed or detracted from this truth. This was interpreted by his Judaizing opponents, who were wont to misrepresent all his actions and words, and in every way to infuse distrust of him, as if he had grudged the Galatians those higher privileges which they might have obtained by the reception of Judaism, Gal. iv. 16.

Paul now chose as the scene of his labors for the spread of the gospel, the centre of intercourse and traffic for a large part of Asia, the city of Ephesus, the most considerable place of commerce on this side of the Taurus. But here also was a central point for mental intercourse; so that no sooner was Christianity introduced, than it was exposed to new conflicts with foreign tendencies of the religious spirit, which either directly counteracted the new divine element, or threatened to adulterate it. Here was the seat of heathen magic, which originally proceeded from the mystic worship of Artemis,* and here also the Jewish magic, connecting itself with the heathenish, sought to find entrance. The spirit of the times, dissatisfied with all the existing religions, and eager after something new, was favorable to all such religious arts.

After Paul had preached the gospel for three months in the synagogue, he was induced, by the unfriendly disposition manifested by a part of the Jews, to turn his attention to the Gentiles, and met his

by this class of persons would now more painfully surprise, more violently affect him; and the whole epistle bears the marks of such an impresson on his mind. Whichever among the conflicting interpretations of the words in ch. iv. 18 may be taken, this much is evident, that Paul wished that they would act during his absence as they had done during his presence. And this he surely could not have said, if already, during his former residence, they had given him such cause for dissatisfaction. It is arbitrary to refer this only to his first residence among them. Had he during that residence noticed such things among them, he would also have felt that "doubt," *ἀπορία*, in reference to them, he would have perceived the necessity of "changing his voice," *ἀλλάξαι τὴν φωνήν*, and have already made use of this new mode of treatment, v. 20.

* In the unintelligible, enigmatical words on her statue, higher mysteries were sought and a special magical power ascribed to them, see *Clem. Strom.* v. 568, and according to these, forms of incantation were constructed, which were supposed to possess great efficacy, the so-called *Ἐφέσια γράμματα*. Plutarch. *Symposiac.* vii. v.

hearers daily in a school belonging to one of their number, a rhetorician, named Tyrannus. It was most important that the divine power which accompanied the promulgation of the gospel should manifest itself in some striking manner, in opposition to the magic so prevalent here,—which by its apparently great effects deceived and captivated many,—in order to rescue men from these arts of deception, and prepare their hearts to receive the truth. And though a carnal “seeking after signs” might have tempted men (like the Goës Simon) to cleave solely to the sensible phenomena in which the power of the divine was manifested, and to regard Christianity itself as a new and higher kind of magic, a most powerful counteraction against such a temptation proceeded from the essential nature of Christianity, when it really found an entrance into the heart. One remarkable occurrence which took place at this time also greatly contributed to set in the clearest light the opposition which Christianity presented to all such arts of jugglery. A number of Jewish Goëtæ frequented these parts, who pretended that they could expel evil spirits from possessed persons by means of incantations, fumigations, the use of certain herbs, and other arts, which they had derived from King Solomon;* and these people could at times, whether by great dexterity in deceiving the senses, or by availing themselves of certain powers of nature unknown to others, or by the influence of an excited imagination,† produce apparently great effects, though none which really promoted the welfare of mankind.‡ When these Jewish Goëtæ beheld the effects which Paul produced by calling on the name of Jesus, they also attempted to make use of it as a magical formula for the exorcism of evil spirits. The unhappy consequences of this attempt (Acts xix. 15,) made a powerful impression on many, who, as it appeared, had certainly been moved by the miraculous operations of the apostle, so far as to acknowledge Jesus as the author of divine powers in men, but imagined that these powers could be employed in the services of their sinful practices, and in connexion with their vain magical arts. But terrified by the disaster to which we have referred, they now came to the apostle, and professed repentance for their sinful course, and declared their resolution to forsake it. Books full of magical formulæ, which amounted in value to more than “fifty pieces of silver,” were brought together and publicly burnt. This triumph of the gospel over all kinds of delusion and arts of deception was often repeated.

Ephesus was a noted rendezvous for men of various kinds of religious belief, who flocked hither from various parts of the east, and thus were brought under the influence of Christianity; amongst others, Paul here

* See Justin. Dial. c. Tryph. Jud. l. 311, ed. Colon.

† See an example in Josephus, how by such operations the Roman army and the Emperor Vespasian were filled with amazement.—*Antiq.* viii. 2.

‡ The cures they performed were sometimes followed by still greater evils, as Christ himself intimates would be the case; Luke xi. 23. See also *Life of Christ*, pp. 151, 241.

met with twelve disciples of John the Baptist;* the individual who was commissioned by God to prepare for the appearance of the Redeemer among his nation and contemporaries; but, as was usual with the preparatory manifestations of the kingdom of God, different effects were produced according to the different susceptibility of his hearers. There were those of his disciples who, following his directions, attained to a living faith in the Redeemer, and some of whom became apostles; others only attained a very defective knowledge of the person and doctrine of Christ; others again, not imbibing the spirit of their master, held fast their former prejudices, and assumed a hostile attitude towards Christianity; probably the first germ of such an opposition appeared at this time and from it was formed the sect of the disciples of John, which continued to exist in a later age. Those disciples of John whom Paul met at Ephesus, belonged to the second of these classes. Whether they had become the disciples of John himself in Palestine and received baptism from him, or whether they had been won over to his doctrine by means of his disciples in other parts, (which would serve to prove that

* The appearance of these disciples of John at Ephesus bears the impress of historical truth, whether we regard the account itself, or compare it with what we know from other sources to have been the position of John and his disciples in reference to the various tendencies of the age. The obscurity that attaches to the narrative of these disciples cannot be taken as a mark of the unhistorical; it belongs rather to the peculiarities of that uncertain transitional stage which was the result of a mixture of impressions respecting John the Baptist with the scattered accounts received of Christ. No man can form an image with clear and distinct outlines, out of misty, indistinct phenomena. The deficiency is not to be attributed to the historian, but is owing to the peculiar character of historical development at such a period. Instead of our being able to detect an imaginative subjective element, an artistic attempt at historical composition, in this representation, we find, on the contrary, nothing more than the raw material of facts, and miss entirely the historic art of genetic pragmatism. But criticism after the newest fashion professes to have discovered a trickery here which will account for everything. The historical basis is only this, that Apollos, who had been converted to Christianity from the school of the Alexandrine Jews, in consequence of his Alexandrian education had already acquired a more liberal conception of Christianity. He had occupied a solitary, isolated position between the Paulinians and the Judaizers, until by means of Aquila and Priscilla he had become better acquainted with the Paulinian doctrine, and had been induced to connect himself with the Paulinian party. Such was the origin of the fiction which made Apollos one of John's disciples, who was first instructed in Christianity by Aquila and Priscilla. This would not have happened, if the author of the Acts had not needed the disciples of John for his machinery. For surely Paul, as well as Peter, should acquire distinction from the magical effect of the imposition of his hands on persons of different religious convictions, who, on passing over to Christianity should thus be made partakers of pretended higher spiritual gifts. This had already taken place among the Jews, Samaritans, and Gentiles; only the disciples of John were left, and these therefore must also serve as a foil, in order that the same fabrication which at an earlier period had procured such honor for Peter in the family of Cornelius, might now among John's disciples, in a corresponding manner glorify Paul, who was not to be regarded as inferior to his fellow-apostle. Whoever can satisfy himself with this unnatural tissue of plan-making so wholly opposed to the impression which such a book must make upon every unperverted mind—is welcome to do so!

John's disciples aimed at forming a separate community which necessarily would soon assume a jealous and hostile position toward Christianity on its first rapid spread) at all events, they had accepted the little they had heard of the person and doctrine of Jesus as the Messiah, to whom John pointed his followers, and considered themselves justified in professing to be Christians* like others. Paul believed that he should find them such; but, on further conversation with them, it appeared that they understood nothing of the power of the glorified Saviour, and of the communication of divine life through him,—that they knew nothing of a Holy Spirit. Paul then imparted to them more accurate instruction on the relation between the ministry of John and that of Christ, between the baptism of John and the baptism which would initiate them into communion with Christ, and into a participation of the divine life that proceeded from him. After that, he baptized them in the name of Christ, with the usual consecration by the sign of the laying-on of hands and the accompanying prayer; and their reception into Christian fellowship was sealed by the usual manifestations of Christian inspiration.†

Paul's residence at Ephesus was not only of considerable importance for the spread of Christianity throughout Asia Minor, for which object he incessantly labored either by undertaking journeys himself, or by means of disciples whom he sent out as missionaries; but it was also a great advantage for the churches that were already formed in this region, as from this central point of intercourse he could most easily receive in-

* The name *μαθηται*, Acts xix. 1, without any other designation, can certainly be understood only of the disciples of Jesus; and the manner in which Paul addressed them implies that they were considered Christians.

† Whoever is capable of transporting himself into the apostolic age, will assuredly not fail to perceive the historical impress in this narrative, and will not attempt with Baur to regard the "prophesying" and "speaking with tongues" as merely mythical designations for the impartation of the Holy Spirit through Christianity. The phenomena of the higher life are wont to wear peculiar marks in different ages. Thus the phenomena of whose qualities we have already spoken belong to the peculiar marks of the inspiration proceeding from the new divine life when it took possession of men's souls. There are not wanting analogies in history of general religious awakenings or "*revivals*," though we need not, therefore, overlook the difference in reference to the greater or less purity in the development of the divine life. Nor is there any occasion whatever for attributing a magical effect to baptism or the laying on of hands; but we must only regard these as individual points in the connexion of the whole, and related to the entire preceding spiritual operation on the minds of the disciples of John. Have we not then, here, perfectly definite historical marks which exclude everything mythical? Does not the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians refer to such phenomena which everywhere accompanied the development of the Christian life? Does not Paul appeal to operations of the Pneuma among the Galatian churches (Gal. iii. 2, 5.) which distinguished the new creation of faith from the old legal state, and does he not recount, moreover, the "miracles," *δυνάμεις*, which were efficacious among the Galatians? We well know, indeed, that the communication of the Spirit contains more than this in itself, but still these marks are not excluded. Those phenomena, so far from belonging to the department of the mythical, rather necessarily belong to the historical image of this memorable age.

telligence from all quarters, and, by means of letters or messengers, could attend to their religious and moral condition, as the necessities of the churches might require. His anxiety for these his spiritual children always accompanied him; he often reminded them that he remembered them daily in his prayers with thanksgiving and intercession; thus he assured the Corinthians, in the overflowing of his love, that he bore them continually in his heart; and vividly depicted his daily care for all the churches he had founded by his touching interrogations, "Who is weak in faith and I am not weak? Who meets with a stumbling-block and I am not disturbed even more than himself?" 2 Cor. xi. 29.

Cases of the latter kind must often have excited the grief of the apostle; for as the Christian faith gradually gained the ascendancy and affected the general tone of thinking in society, new views of life in general, and a new mode of feeling, were formed in the Gentile world; and in opposition to the immoral licentiousness of heathenism, which men were led to renounce by the new principles of the Christian life, an anxiously legal and Jewish mode of thinking, which burdened the conduct with numberless restraints, was likely to find entrance among them, and must have disturbed the minds of many who had not attained settled Christian convictions.

Probably it was soon after his arrival at Ephesus that Paul received the information respecting the state of the Galatian churches which awakened his fears. During his last residence among them, he had perceived the machinations of a Judaizing party, which were likely to injure the purity of the Christian faith and the freedom of the Christian spirit. He was aware of the danger which threatened from this quarter, and had taken measures to counteract it; he was not successful, however, in averting the approaching storm, as he now experienced to his great sorrow.

The adversaries whom he had here to contend with were unwilling to acknowledge his apostolic authority, because he had not been instructed and called to the apostleship immediately by Christ himself; they maintained that all preaching of the gospel must rest on the authority of the apostles who were appointed by Christ himself; they endeavored to detect a contrariety between the doctrine of Paul and the doctrine of the apostles, who had allowed the observance of the law in their churches, and in consequence accused him of a departure from the pure doctrine of Christ. They could also appeal to the fact, that he represented himself when among the Jews as a Jew observing the law, and therefore, when he taught otherwise among the Gentiles, he could only do it in order to flatter them, to the injury of their true interest.

Although the anti-Pauline tendency in the Galatian churches was connected with that party which had its principal seat in Palestine, yet per-

sons who proceeded from the midst of the Gentile Christians,* and had submitted to circumcision, acted here principally as the organs of this party, and exercised the greatest influence. To such the words of Paul in Gal. vi. 13 must relate; that even those who were circumcised, or wished to be so, did not themselves observe the law. These must have been originally Gentiles, and, on this supposition, it is less difficult to understand, how he could say of them that they themselves did not observe the law; for to persons who had grown up in heathenism, it could not be so easy a matter to practise the complete round of Jewish observances. But, as is most generally the case with proselytes, they were peculiarly zealous for the party to which, notwithstanding their Grecian descent, they had devoted themselves, and their influence with their countrymen was far more dangerous than that of the Jewish false teachers.

Such a mixture of Judaism and Christianity threatened to destroy the whole substance of Christianity, and to substitute a Jewish ceremonial service in the place of a genuine Christian conversion proceeding from a living faith; and the danger which thus threatened the divine work made a deep impression on the apostles. In order to give the Galatian Christians an evidence of his love, of which the Judaizers wished to excite a mistrust, and to make it evident what importance he attached to the subject, he undertook to write an epistle to them *with his own hand*, contrary to his usual custom, and a difficult task for one

* This entirely depends upon whether we adopt the *lectio recepta* in Gal. vi. 13, *περιτεμνόμενοι*, "who are having themselves circumcised," or the reading of the *codex Vaticanus* approved by Lachmann [and Tischendorf], *περιτετμημένοι*, "who have had themselves circumcised." I cannot help considering the first (which has the greatest number of original authorities in its favor) as the correct reading, partly also on this account, that we cannot imagine any reason why any one should be induced to explain the latter, a word requiring no explanation, by the former, a more difficult one, and on the contrary, it may be easily accounted for, how a person might think of explaining the former by the latter. If the *lectio recepta* be the correct one, the expression cannot refer to circumcised Jews, but only to Gentiles who suffered themselves to be circumcised. That the most influential seducers of the Galatian churches were such, appears to me to be intimated also by the word "cut off," *ἀποκόψονται*, v. 12. Hence may be better explained the impassioned terms, proceeding from a truly holy zeal, with which Paul speaks against these persons. If *circumcision* be not enough for them, let them have *excision* also; if, falling away from the religion of the spirit, they seek their salvation in these outward, worthless things and would make themselves dependent upon them. The pathos with which he here speaks, testifies his zeal for the salvation of souls, and for the elevated spiritual character of Christianity, in opposition to all ceremonial services by which Christianity and human nature would be degraded. And there is no occasion for the apology made by Jerome, although what he says is correct, that we must look on the apostle as a man still subject to human passions; "Nec mirum esse, si Apostolus, ut homo et adhuc vasculo clausus infirmo semel fuerit hoc loquutus, in quod frequenter sanctos viros cadere perspicimus." (Nor is it to be wondered at, if the apostle spoke this as a man, as one still shut up in a weak vessel; a fault into which we frequently see holy men fall.)

who, amidst his manifold engagements, had little practice in writing Greek.*

He begins his Epistle with declaring that his apostolic call was given to him, as to the other apostles, immediately by Christ himself; he assures the Galatian Christians in a most solemn manner that there could be no other gospel than that which he had announced to them, and that it was far from his thoughts to be influenced by the desire of pleasing men in his mode of publishing the gospel;† though when enthralled in Pharisaism, he was actuated only by a regard to human authority, yet since he had devoted himself to the service of Christ, he had renounced all such considerations, and taught and acted in obedience to the divine call, as responsible to God alone.‡ He proved to them by a lucid statement of facts, that from the first he had published the gospel in consequence of immediate divine illumination, and independently of all human authority; and that the other apostles had acknowledged his independent apostolic character. With the firmest conviction that salvation and the fullness of the divine life were to be found only by faith in the Crucified, he turns to the Galatian Christians with the exclamation, "Ye fools, who hath so bewitched you! to forget Jesus the Crucified, whom we have

* Although the proper meaning of the Greek *πηλίκους*, Gal. vi. 11, would lead us to understand it as referring to the large unshapely letters of an unpractised writer, yet I could never find in the words so understood, an expression corresponding to the earnestness of the apostle, and the tone of the whole epistle. Why should he not have expressed, in a more natural manner, how toilsome he had found the task of merely writing in this language? See Schott's Commentary. We are inclined to believe, that he uses the word in the less proper sense for *πόσους*, as in the later Latin authors we often find *quanti* for *quot*. And we may refer it most naturally to the whole epistle as written with his own hand. It will also agree with the use of the word *γράμματα*, when applied to an epistle. But, on the other hand, the use of the dative in this case is unusual, and not agreeable to the Pauline form of expression, and *ἐπιστολῇ* is the word commonly used by Paul for an epistle. The reason of his writing the whole epistle with his own hand, was certainly not to guard against a falsification of it, or the forgery of another in his name; for his opponents, in this instance, were under no temptation to do this, since they were not desirous of ascribing to him any other doctrine than that he taught but were at issue with him respecting the truth of that doctrine, and actually impugned his apostolic authority. The connexion of the passage plainly shows us for what purpose he so expressly stated that he had written the whole with his own hand, namely, to testify that his love for them induced him to undergo any labor on their account, in contrast with the false teachers whom he described in the following verses as seeking their own glory.

† The Judaizers accused him of this in reference to the Gentiles.

‡ Schrader misunderstands Gal. i. 10, when he applies it only to Jews and Judaizing Christians. If we apply the assertion here made in the most general terms, according to the sense intended by Paul, we shall understand it of Gentiles and Gentile Christians. Paul wished to defend himself against the accusation of the Jews, that he wilfully falsified the doctrine of Christ, in order to make it acceptable to the heathen. The "now," *ἄρτι* marks the opposition of his conduct as the "servant of Christ," to his former Pharisaism, of which he afterwards speaks more at large. This view of the passage does away with the inference which Schrader attempts to draw from it, that Paul wrote this epistle during the time of his imprisonment at Rome.

set forth before your eyes as the only ground of our salvation, and to seek in outward things, in the works of the law, that salvation for which ye must be indebted to him alone! Are ye so void of understanding, that after ye have begun your Christianity in the Spirit, in the divine life which proceeds from faith, ye can seek after something higher still (the perfecting of your Christianity,) in the low, the sensuous, and the earthly, in that which can have no elevating influence on the inner life of the spirit, in the observance of outward ceremonies!" He appeals to the evidence of their own experience, that though from the first the gospel had been published to them independently of the law, yet by virtue of faith in the Redeemer alone, the divine power of the gospel had revealed itself among them by manifold operations, among which he reckoned the miracles to which he alludes in chap. iii. 5.

As his opponents supported themselves on the authority of the Old Testament, Paul shows, on the other hand, that the final aim of its contents was to prepare for the appearance of the Redeemer, by whom the wall of separation that had hitherto existed among men was to be taken away, and all men by virtue of faith in him were to receive a divine life; that the promises given to Abraham were annexed to the condition of faith, and would be fulfilled in all who were followers of Abraham in faith as his genuine spiritual children; that the manifestation of the law formed only a preparatory intervening period between the giving of the promise and its fulfillment by the appearance of the Redeemer. He placed Judaism and Heathenism—though, in other respects, he viewed these religions as essentially different—in one class in relation to Christianity; the state of pupillage in religion, compared with the state of maturity which the children of God attained for the full enjoyment of their rights; the dependence of religion on outward, sensible things, an outward cultus, consisting in various ceremonies, compared with a religion of freedom (which proceeded from faith) of the spirit, and of the inward life.*

As his opponents charged him with a want of uprightness, and with releasing the Gentiles from the burdensome observance of the law, merely from a wish to ingratiate himself with them, he could adopt no more suitable method of vindicating himself, and of infusing confidence into the Galatian Christians, than by proposing the example of his own life for imitation. He lived among the Gentiles as a Gentile, without submitting to the restrictions of the Mosaic law, which certainly he would not have done if he had believed that it was impossible to attain the full possession of the blessings of the Messiah's kingdom without the observance of the law. Hence he made this demand on the Galatians (iv. 12,)†

* Compare with what has been before said, p. 157, ff.

† I agree with Usteri in the explanation of these words. That the Galatians had at that time adopted the practice of Jewish ceremonies, and therefore that Paul could not in this respect have said, "I am become like you,"—can form no valid objection to this interpretation; for the Galatian Christians, all of whom certainly had not devoted themselves

"Become as I am (in reference to the non-observance of the law), for I am become as you are, like you as Gentiles in the non-observance of the law, although a native Jew." Now, if his method of becoming to the Jews a Jew, by observing the ceremonies of the law when amongst them in Palestine, had been at all inconsistent with what he here said of himself, he would not have appealed with such confidence to his own example. But, according to his own principles, such a contradiction could not exist; for, if he did not constantly observe the ceremonies of the law, but only under certain relations and circumstances, this sufficiently showed that he no longer ascribed to them an objective importance, that according to his conviction they could contribute nothing to the justification and sanctification of men; and as this was his principle in reference to all outward, and in themselves indifferent things, he only submitted to them for the benefit of others, according to the dictates of wisdom and love.

Paul called upon the Galatians to stand firm in the liberty gained for them by Christ, and not to bring themselves again under the yoke of bondage. He assured them, that if they were circumcised, Christ would profit them nothing; that every man who submitted to circumcision was bound to observe the whole law; that since they sought to be justified by the law, they had renounced their connexion with Christ, they were fallen from the possession of grace. For he means not outward circumcision considered in itself, but in its connexion with the religious principle involved in it, as far as the Gentile who submitted to circumcision did so in the conviction that by it, and therefore by the law (to whose observance a man was bound by circumcision) justification was to be obtained. And this conviction stood in direct opposition to that disposition which depended on the Saviour alone for salvation.

The apostle, in contrasting his true, upright love to the Galatian Christians, with the pretended zeal of the Judaizers for their salvation, said to them, "They have a zeal on your account, but not in the right way; they wish to exclude you from the kingdom of God that you may be zealous about them, that is, they wish to persuade you, that you cannot as uncircumcised Gentiles enter the kingdom of God, in order that you may emulate them, that you may be circumcised as they are, as if thus only you can become members of the kingdom of God. Those who are disposed to boast of their outward preëminence (of outward Judaism), compel you to be circumcised only that they may not be persecuted with the cross of Christ, (that is, with the doctrine of Christ the Crucified, as the only ground of salvation), that they may not be obliged to owe their salvation to Him alone, and to renounce all their merits, all in which they think themselves distinguished above others.* They wish

to the observance of the law, still belonged to the stock of the Gentiles, and with this view, the term *ὑμεῖς* is used. In such epigrammatic expressions, single terms are not in general to be pressed too strongly.

* I here adopt an interpretation of the words in Gal. vi. 12, different from that which

you to be circumcised only that they may glory in your flesh, that is, in the change which they have outwardly effected in you, by bringing you over altogether to the Jewish Christian party." The apostle, lastly, adjured the Galatians that they would not give him any further trouble,

from ancient times has been received by most expositors, and which, without being closely examined, has been mentioned by Usteri only with unqualified disapprobation. I will, therefore, state a few things in its favor. The common explanation of the passage is, "These persons compel you to be circumcised, only because they are not willing to be persecuted for the cross of Christ; that is, in order to avoid the persecutions which the publication of the doctrine of justification through faith alone, in Jesus the Crucified, will bring upon them from the Jews." The use of the dative certainly suits this interpretation, although I believe that Paul, if he had wished to give utterance to so simple a thought, would have expressed himself more plainly. Gal. v. 11, might favor this interpretation, where Paul says of himself, that if he still preached the necessity of circumcision, then the offence which the Jews took at Christianity, on account of the doctrine that a man by faith in the Crucified might become an heir of the kingdom of heaven, without the observance of the law, would at once be taken away; and no reason would be left for persecuting him as a preacher of the gospel. But in order to avoid such persecutions on the part of the Jews, these persons had need only to observe the law strictly themselves, and to beware of publishing the doctrine, that a man could be justified without the works of the law; by no means would they have been obliged to press circumcision so urgently on the Gentiles already converted, nor does Paul ever ascribe to his Judaizing opponents the design of avoiding the persecution that threatened them by such conduct. And if, as has been indicated, the most influential opponents of Paul in the Galatian churches were of Gentile descent, this interpretation would still less hold good, for Gentiles would have brought persecutions on themselves sooner by the observance of Jewish ceremonies, than by the observance of the Christian religion, which was not conspicuous in outward rites. And how would this interpretation suit the connexion? Paul says (Gal. vi. 12), "Those who wish to have some preëminence in outward things (some outward distinction before others) oblige you to be circumcised." After this, we expect something related to it, in the clause beginning with "lest," *ἵνα μὴ*, something that may serve as an exegesis, or fix the meaning. But according to this interpretation, something quite foreign would follow—that thereby they wish to avoid persecution. If this thought followed, Paul would have said at first—"Those who long after ease for the flesh, or who are afraid to bear the cross of Christ (or something of the kind), force circumcision upon you," etc. Verse 14 also shows, that all the emphasis is laid on *glorying* alone in the cross of Christ, which is opposed to setting a high value on any other *glorying*. The thought arising from that interpretation appears quite foreign to the context, both before and after. On the other hand, the interpretation I have adopted suits it entirely. That "making a fair show in the flesh," *εὐπροσωπεῖν ἐν σαρκί*, that "glorying according to the flesh," *καύχημα κατὰ σαρκά*, is taken away, if men can glory only in the cross of Christ. Hence they consider the cross of Christ, that is, the doctrine of faith in the Crucified, the only sufficient means of salvation, as something wearing a hostile aspect towards them, by which they are persecuted, since it obliges them to renounce their fancied superiority. With the positive clause in v. 12, "those who wish to have some preëminence according to the flesh," the negative clause, therefore, agrees well, "that they may not be persecuted with or by the cross of Christ," (the cross of Christ as something subjective to them, by which they are persecuted). The mention of the cross first, according to the best accredited reading adopted by Lachmann, also suits this view of the passage. According to the other view, all the emphasis is to be placed on the not being persecuted. On the whole, the leading idea of the whole passage appears to be, glorying in the cross of Christ, in opposition to glorying in the flesh.

since he bore in his body the mark of the sufferings he had endured for the cause of Christ.*

During his residence at Ephesus, the affairs of the Corinthian church demanded his special attention. The history of this community furnishes us an example of developments and agitations such as have been often repeated in later periods of the church on a larger scale. A variety of influences operated on this church, and it is impossible to refer everything to one common ground of explanation, such as the relation † between the different parties; although one common cause, which will explain many of these influences, may be found in the particular situation of the Christian church, which the new Christian spirit, opposed as it was by former habits of life, and the general state of society, had but partially penetrated. Many of the easily excited and mobile Greeks had been carried away by the powerful impression of Paul's ministry made at Corinth, and at first showed great zeal for Christianity; but the principles of Christianity had taken no deep root in their unsettled dispositions. In a city like Corinth, where so great a corruption of morals prevailed, and so many incentives to the indulgence of the passions were presented on every side, such a superficial conversion was exposed to the greatest danger. In addition to this, after Paul had laid the foundation of the church, other preachers followed him, who published the gospel partly in another form, and partly on other principles, and who, since their various natural peculiarities were not properly subordinated to the essential principles of the gospel, gave occasion to many divisions among the Greeks, a people ‡ naturally inclined to parties and party disputes.§ There were at first persons of the same spirit as those false

* If we only consider what is narrated in the Acts of his sufferings hitherto, though it is evident from a comparison with 2 Cor. xi. that all is not mentioned, we shall be as little disposed as by what the apostle says of the persecutions of the Jews, to apply these words (with Schrader) to his imprisonment at Rome. What Paul says in chap. ii. 10, respecting the fulfilment of obligations to the poor at Jerusalem, might favor the later composition of this epistle, but proves nothing; for the words by no means lead us to think of that last large collection, of which he undertook to be the bearer to Jerusalem. He might very often have sent separate contributions from the churches of Gentile Christians to Jerusalem, although, owing to the imperfections of church history, we have no certain information respecting them. On his last journey preceding his last visit to the Galatians, he might have brought with him one of these smaller collections.

† By attempting to deduce too much from this single cause, Storr has indulged in many forced interpretations and assumptions.

‡ Owing to this national characteristic, the efficiency of the gospel among them was much disturbed and weakened in after ages.

§ Rückert thinks that the order in which the parties are mentioned in 1 Cor. i. 12, corresponds to the period of their formation; that first the preaching of Apollos occasioned a portion of the church to attach themselves rather to Apollos than to Paul, with whom they no longer felt fully satisfied, though they had not yet formed themselves into a particular party; then the Judaizers, taking advantage of such a state of feeling, joined the partisans of Apollos in opposition to Paul; thus two parties were formed. But in course of time the original partisans of Apollos discovered that they could

teachers of the Galatian churches, who wished to introduce a Christianity more mingled with Judaism—who could not endure the independence and freedom with which the gospel published by Paul was developed among the Gentiles, although they were not so violent as the Galatian false teachers, and accordingly named themselves, not after James, whom the most decided Judaizers made their chief authority, but after Peter. Moreover, we must carefully notice the difference of circumstances. The Galatian churches were more easily operated upon by organs of the Judaizing party, who came forward from among themselves. It was altogether different at Corinth, where the Judaizers had to operate upon men of a decidedly Grecian character, who were not so susceptible of the influence of Judaism. Hence they did not venture to come forward at once, and disclose their intentions: it was necessary first to prepare the soil before they scattered the seed; to act warily and gently; to accomplish their work gradually; to employ a variety of artifices, in order to undermine the principles on which Paul preached the gospel; to infuse a mistrust of his apostolic character, and thus to alienate the affections of his converts from him.* They began with casting doubts on Paul's apostolic dignity, for the reasons which have been before mentioned; they set in opposition to him, as the only genuine apostles, those who were instructed and ordained by Christ himself. They understood besides how to instil into anxious minds a number of scruples, to which a life spent in intercourse with heathens would easily give rise, and which persons who had been previously proselytes to Judaism must have been predisposed to entertain.

Persons whose minds took this direction, placed Peter, as an apostle chosen by the Lord himself, and especially distinguished by him, in opposition to Paul, who had assumed the office at a later period. When the strongly marked individuality of any of the apostles appropriated and impressed itself upon Christianity, the varied form thus given to it was fitted to the different spheres of activity assigned the apostles by God, and served not to injure the unity of the Christian spirit, but rather in this very manifoldness to illustrate its excellence; but now among those who attached themselves to this or the other apostles, one-sided tendencies became prominent, and that variety which could and

not agree with the Judaizers, who had at first, in order to find an entrance, concealed their peculiarities, and thus at last there arose a third distinct party. But this passage (i. 12) cannot avail for determining the chronological relation of these parties to one another. . Paul here follows the *logical* relation, without adverting to the chronological order. He places the partisans of Apollos next to those of Paul, because they only formed a particular section of the Pauline party; he then mentions those who were their most strenuous opponents; and lastly, those through whose existence the other parties would be pre-supposed. We have throughout no data by which to determine the chronological connexion of the first three parties.

* See the remarks of Baur, in his essay on the Christ-party in the Corinthian church (in the *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*, 1831, part iv., p. 83.)

should have consisted with unity, was converted by them into an exclusive contrariety. As a one-sided Petrine party was formed in the Corinthian church, so a one-sided Pauline party sprang up in opposition to it, which recognised the Pauline as the only genuine form of Christianity, ridiculed the nice distinctions of scrupulous consciences, and set themselves in stern opposition to everything Jewish. In one of their tendencies we find the germ of the later Judaizing sects, and in the other, that of the later Marcionite error.

But in the Pauline party itself a two-fold direction was manifested on the following grounds. Among the disciples of John who came to Ephesus, and considered themselves as Christians, though their knowledge was very defective, was Apollos, a Jew of Alexandria, who had received the Jewish-Grecian education, peculiar to the learned among the Alexandrian Jews, and had great facility in the use of the Greek language.* Aquila and his wife instructed him more accurately in Christianity, and when he was about to sail to Achaia, commended him to the Corinthian church as a man who, by his zeal and peculiar gifts, would be able to do much for the furtherance of the divine cause, especially at Corinth, where his Alexandrian education would procure him a more ready access to a part of the Jews and Gentiles. His Alexandrian mode of developing and representing Christian truths, approaching nearer to the Grecian taste, was peculiarly adapted to the educated classes at Corinth; but fascinated by it, they attached too great importance to this peculiar form, and despised, in contrast with it, the simple preaching of Paul, who, when he taught among them, determined to know nothing save Jesus the crucified. We here see the germ of that Gnosis which sprung up in the soil of Alexandria, and aimed at exalting itself above the simple faith (Pistis) of the gospel.

But it has been lately maintained† that the difference between the Pauline party and that of Apollos, related not to any difference in the

* The epithet, ἀνὴρ λόγιος, "eloquent man," given to him in Acts xviii. 24, probably denotes, not an eloquent, but a learned man, which would best suit an Alexandrian, since a learned literary education, and not eloquence, was the precise distinction of the Alexandrians; and his disputation with the Jews at Corinth suits this meaning of λόγιος, taken from the Jewish point of view. In this sense the word is found both in Josephus and Philo; in the first, λόγοι is opposed to "unlearned," ἰδιώταις, *De Bell. Jud.* vi. 5, § 3; and by Philo, *De Vita Mosi*, i. § 5, Αἰγυπτίων οἱ λόγοι, (the learned of the Egyptians.) But since another meaning of the word, as it was at that time, is also possible, and since it appears, from the First Epistle to the Corinthians, that Apollos was also a man eloquent in the Greek language, we are left in some uncertainty how to understand the epithet. According to the first interpretation, "mighty in the Scriptures," δυνατὸς ὢν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς, would only more precisely express what is contained in λόγιος; according to the second, it would be a perfectly new and distinct characteristic. This exegetical question is of no importance historically, for certainly both epithets are applicable to Apollos.

† By a distinguished young theologian, the licentiate Daniel Schenkel, in his *Inquisitio Critico-historica de Ecclesia Corinthiaca*, *primæva*, Basileæ, 1838, with which De Wette, in his late Commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians, has expressed his concurrence.

form of doctrine, but only to the relation in which Paul and Apollos stood to the founding of the Corinthian church, as the apostle himself, in 1 Cor. iii. 6, 7, indicates that it was made a question, whether he who laid the foundation, or he who raised the superstructure, deserved the preëminence. But if we follow this hint, it will conduct us much further. We cannot stop short at these merely outward relations, but must seek in the characteristic qualities of these two men, who stood in such different relations to the church, for the reason that some were more attached to the one, and some to the other. We may presume that the manner in which one laid the foundation, and the other raised the superstructure, depended on the difference of their characteristic qualities. To this difference Paul himself adverts, when, after speaking of the merely outward relations between himself and Apollos, he represents in figurative language the various structures which may be reared on the foundation which has been once laid, and to which every genuine teacher of Christianity must confine himself; 1 Cor. iii. 12. The connexion evidently shows, that Paul had primarily in view his relation to the party of Apollos; every other explanation is forced.* If we compare the qualities possessed by the apostle and his fellow-laborer, as far as our information extends, we may easily infer the difference in their mode of teaching, and in their respective partisans. That Paul possessed great force and command of language, we may conclude with certainty from his epistles, as well as from his discourse at Athens. In that eloquence which is adapted to seize powerfully on men's minds, he was inferior to no preacher of the gospel, not even to Apollos himself. This was his peculiar, natural gift, sanctified and elevated for the cause of the gospel, in which he may well have been superior even to Apollos; and if the Epistle to the Hebrews† is to be attributed to the latter, and we compare it with those of Paul, it would serve to confirm the opinion. In dialectic power also, which was grounded in the peculiar character of his intellect, and developed and improved by his youthful training in the schools of the Pharisees, as well as in the skilful interpretation and use of the Old Testament, he was certainly surpassed by none. But still between himself and Apollos a difference not unimportant existed, which affected their peculiar style of teaching; the latter, as an Alexandrian, had received an education more adapted to the Grecian mind and taste, and possessed a greater familiarity with the pure Grecian phraseology, in which Paul was defective, as we may gather from his epistles, and as he expressly asserts;

* We must carefully distinguish those who, by assailing the unchangeable foundation of Christianity, destroyed the temple of God in the church, 1 Cor. iii. 16 and 17, from those of whom Paul judged far more leniently, because they preserved inviolate the foundation that was laid, though they added to it what was more or less human. Of the latter, he affirms that, "since they held fast the foundation of salvation, they would finally be partakers of salvation, though after a painful and repeated process of purification; of the others, that they would come to ruin, because they had destroyed the work of God."

† See farther on.

2 Cor. xi. 6. Now, in making the gospel known at Corinth, he had special reasons for rejecting all the aids that otherwise were at his command for recommending evangelical truth, and for using only the "demonstration of the spirit and of power," which accompanied its simple annunciation. The Alexandrian culture of Apollos must thus have formed a striking contrast to the simplicity of Paul's preaching; and, if we take into account the circumstances and social relations of the Corinthians, we cannot wonder that a preference for such a style of address led to the formation of a distinct party in the Corinthian church. It was not the peculiar style of Apollos in itself which Paul condemned; it became every teacher to work with the gifts entrusted to him, according to the training which the Lord had given him; but he combated the one-sided and arrogant over-valuation of this talent, the excessive estimation in which this form of mental culture was held. It by no means follows, that he attributed a false wisdom to Apollos himself;* but the one-sided direction of his partisans, in which the "seeking after wisdom," *σοφίαν ζητεῖν*, predominated, would easily produce a false wisdom, by which evangelical truth would be obscured or thrust into the background. Paul perceived this threatening danger, and hence felt himself impelled strenuously to combat the principle on which such a tendency was founded.

Besides the parties already mentioned, we find a fourth in the Corinthian church, whose peculiarities it is more difficult to ascertain, since, judging from its name, we cannot readily suppose that it belonged to a sect blamed by the apostle, and in no other part of the first Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians do we find any distinct references to it from which we might infer its specific character; it was composed of persons who said that they were "*of Christ*;" 1 Cor. i. 12. If we consider this party as involved in the censure expressed by the apostle,† which the grammat-

* This charge against Apollos, in the opinion of Schenkel and De Wette, is well founded, but by no means follows from the view taken by ourselves and others of the peculiarities of the party of Apollos.

† The interpretation which has been proposed by Pott and Schott, and according to which, all conjectures respecting the peculiar character of a Christ-party at Corinth would be superfluous, is grammatically possible. It assumes that Paul, in this passage, only enumerated historically the various parties in the Corinthian church, and does not infer that all who are specified came under the censure of the apostle. Those indeed who firmly adhered to the doctrine taught by Paul, and esteemed him, as he wished, only as an organ of Christ; those who wished to keep aloof from all party contentions, and called themselves only after Christ their common head, must be represented as a particular party in relation to the other Corinthian parties, and hence Paul distinguished them by the name which they assumed in opposition to all party feelings. If the words in this connexion only contained an historical enumeration of the various parties, such an interpretation might be valid. But this is not the case. Paul evidently mentions these parties in terms of censure. The censure applies to all equally as parties who substituted something in the place of that single relation to Christ which alone was of real worth. "Has then Christ become divided?" he proceeds to ask. "No—he will not allow himself to be divided. Ye ought all to call yourselves after that one Christ who redeemed you by his death on

ical construction of the passage seems to require, we must believe that these persons did not wish to be "of Christ," in the sense in which Paul desired that all the Corinthians should be, but that they appropriated Christ to themselves in an erroneous sense, and wished to make him, as it were, the head of their party. And we must then suppose that the apostle, though with an allusion in the first instance to their party designation, yet including a reference to all the Corinthian parties, said, "Is the one Christ become divided? has each party their portion of Christ, as their own Christ? No! there is only one Christ for all, who was crucified for you, to whom ye were devoted and pledged by baptism."

We have now to inquire what can be determined respecting the character and origin of this Christ-party. If we regard its being mentioned next to the party of Peter, and compare this with the collocation of the parties of Apollos and Paul, we might think it most probable that the relation between the two former was similar to that which existed between the two latter; and that, therefore, a subdivision of the general party of Jewish Christians was intended. And as part of these attached themselves to Peter, and part to James, we might be led to imagine a party belonging to James as well as a Petrine party; the former more tenacious and violent in their Judaism; the latter more liberal and moderate. But this supposition is not at all favored by the designation, "they of Christ," οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, for the interpretation,* that the adherents of James should so name themselves, because the epithet "brother of Christ," ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ, was given to that apostle as a title of honor, seems very unnatural. There can be no doubt that if such a party had existed in Corinth, they would have called themselves "those of James," οἱ τοῦ Ἰακώβου.

The view that the Christ-party was composed of Jewish Christians must be stated and developed very differently in order to bring it nearer to probability.† The name οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, it may be said, was one which the partisans of Peter assumed in opposition to Paul and his disciples, in order to mark themselves as those who adhered to the genuine apostles of Christ, from whom they had received the pure doctrine of Christ, and thus by their teachers were connected with Christ himself;

the cross, and to whom ye were devoted by baptism." These words are directed equally against all parties, and perhaps exactly in this form, owing to the preceding designation of those who arrogantly named themselves "those of Christ," οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. But if these persons had assumed this title in the sense which Paul approved, he would not have classed them with those who incurred his censure; these words could not have applied to them but he must have expressed his approbation of their spirit which must have appeared to him as the only right one.

* By Storr, or by Berthold, as having reference to several ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου among the first preachers of the gospel.

† As it has lately been developed with much spirit and acuteness, in the essay already referred to by Baur, in the *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*, 1831, which no person can read without instruction, even if they do not agree with the views of the writer.

and, on the other hand, by applying this title exclusively to their own party, they intended to brand the other Christians at Corinth as those who did not deserve the name of Christians, who were not the disciples of Christ, nor the scholars of a genuine apostle of Christ, but of a man who had adulterated the pure Christian doctrine, and had promulgated a doctrine of his own arbitrary invention as the doctrine of Christ. This view would appear perfectly to correspond with the phrase *οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, and might be confirmed by many antithetical references in both the epistles in which Paul vindicates his genuine apostolic character, and asserts, that he could say with the same right as any one else, that he was "*of Christ*;" 2 Cor. x. 7. But while such passages certainly are directed against those who, on the grounds already mentioned, disputed Paul's apostolic authority, they by no means prove the existence of such a party-name among the Jews. Some persons might easily be led to find in 2 Cor. x. 7, a confirmation of that view of the Christ-party. But however they might be led by the similarity of the expression to refer this passage to the Christ-party and to make use of it according to this supposition, yet we must dispute the correctness of such an application; for evidently the reference here is not to a party like those who are named in 1 Cor. i. 12, but only to the leaders of a certain clique who maintained that they stood as preachers of the gospel in a special relation to Christ, and wished to take the precedence of Paul; those Judaizing party-leaders who with their obtrusive urgency and intermeddling believed they could boast of great activity in the cause of the gospel. But because such men boasted personally of their special connexion with Christ, it by no means follows that a party attaching itself to them could have felt justified in transferring to itself collectively what they claimed for themselves as individuals.

And then the difficulty still remains, that by the position of the phrase *οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, we are led to expect the designation of a party in some way differing from the Petrine, though belonging to the same general division; but, according to this view, the Christ-party would differ from the Petrine only in name, which would be quite contradictory to the relation of this party-name to those that preceded it.* Accordingly, this view can only be tenable, if not a merely formal, but a material difference can be found between the two last parties. And it might, perhaps, be said that not all the members of the Petrine party, but only the most rigid and violent in their Judaism, who would not acknowledge the Pauline Gentile Christians as standing in communion with the Messiah,

* Baur says indeed, p. 77, "The apostle's object in accumulating so many names, might be to depict the party spirit prevalent in the Corinthian church, which showed itself in their delighting in the multiplication of sectarian names, which denoted various tints and shades, but not absolutely distinct parties." But if this were the case, the explanation by which a different shade of party is pointed out can be correct only of one of these party-names.

had applied to their Judaizing party the exclusive epithet of *οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*.*

But it has always appeared to us to be contrary to historical analogy, that those persons who adhered, in opposition to Paul, to another apostle, and considered him alone as genuine, should not name themselves after one whom they looked upon as the necessary link of their connexion with Christ. In the epistle itself, we cannot find allusions that would establish this, since the passages which may be supposed to contain such allusions can be very well understood without them.

We cannot hope in this inquiry to attain to conclusions altogether certain and sure, for the marks and historical data are not sufficient for the purpose. But we shall best guard against arbitrary conjectures, and arrive at the truth most confidently, if we first attend to what may be gathered from the name itself and its position in relation to the other party-names, and then compare this with the whole state of the Corinthian church. In the results which may thus be obtained, we must then endeavor to separate the doubtful and disputable from the certain or probable.

We shall by no means be justified in concluding that, by virtue of the logical connexion of the two members of the sentence to one another, the persons who named themselves after Christ must have borne the same relation to the Petrine party as the adherents of Apollos to those of Paul. This conclusion, if correct, would be favorable to the view which we last considered. But the relation of the two members is not logical only, but subject to certain historical conditions. Paul does not, as in other cases, form the members of the antithesis merely from the thoughts; but the manner in which he selected his terms was determined by matters of fact. As the Judaizers formed in reality only one party, Paul could designate them only by one name, and since he was obliged to choose his terms according to the facts, he could not make the two members exactly correspond to one another.

From the name of this party viewed in relation to other party-names, we shall arrive at the following conclusion with tolerable certainty. There were those who, while they renounced the apostles, professed to adhere to Christ alone, to acknowledge him only as their teacher, and to receive what he announced as truth from himself without the intervention of any other person. This was such a manifestation of self-will, such an arrogant departure from the historical process of development ordained by God in the appropriation of divine revelation, as would in the issue lead to an arbitrary treatment of the contents of Christian doctrine; for the apostles were the organs ordained and formed by God, by whom the doctrine of Christ was to be propagated, and its meaning communicated to all men. But it might easily happen, while some were disposed

† This last form of this hypothesis has been fully developed by its author in the *Tübinger Zeitschrift*, 1836, 4 Heft.

to adhere to Paul alone, others to Apollos, and a third party to Peter, at last some persons appeared who would adhere to none of these parties, and professed to follow Christ alone, yet with an arrogant self-will which set aside all human instrumentality ordained by God. If we now view this as the result which presents itself to us with tolerable certainty, that there was at Corinth a party *desirous of attaching themselves to Christ alone, independently of the apostles, who constructed in their own way a Christianity different from that announced by the apostles*, we may imagine three different ways in which they proceeded. For this object they might have made use of a collection of the sayings of Christ, which had fallen into their hands, and set what they found there in opposition to the apostolic doctrines; or they might have pretended to derive their Christianity from an inward source of knowledge, either a supernatural inward light or the light of natural reason—a more mystical or a more rational tendency. If we assented to the first supposition, still we could not satisfy ourselves without imagining a certain subjective element in the manner of explaining those discourses of Christ; for without the infusion of such an element, the tendency to this separation from the apostolic instrumentality could not have originated, and thus the principal question would still remain to be answered, whether we are to consider the subjective element as mystical or rational.

According to a hypothesis* lately developed with great acuteness, but resting on a number of arbitrary suppositions, the tendency we are speaking of must have been mystical. As Paul had considered the immediate revelation of Christ to himself as equivalent to the outward election of the other apostles; so there were other persons who thought that they could appeal to such an inward revelation or vision, and thus assail the apostolic authority of Paul, while they sought to establish their own, and threatened to substitute an inward ideal Christ for the historical Christ. These representatives of the one-sided mystical tendency, should have been the principal opponents with whom Paul had to contend. But in the Epistles to the Corinthians we can find no trace of such a tendency combated by him; and in all the passages to which the advocates of this hypothesis appeal, a reference to it seems to be arbitrarily imposed.

When Paul, at the beginning of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, so impressively brings forward the doctrine of Christ the Crucified, and says that he had published this in all its simplicity without attempting to support it by the Grecian philosophy, there is not the slightest intimation that a tendency (such as we have alluded to) which aimed at substituting another Christ in the room of Christ the Crucified, existed in the Corinthian church. In a place where, by the over-valuation of any kind of philosophy, the simple gospel was liable to be set in the back-

* By Schenkel in the Essay before mentioned, and advocated by De Wette in his Commentary on the two Epistles to the Corinthians.

ground, such language might very properly have been used, even though no ideal or mystical Christ were substituted instead of the historical; and it is evident to what false conclusions we should be led, if we inferred from such a declaration the existence of a tendency that denied Christ the Crucified. Paul opposed the preaching of Jesus the Crucified to two tendencies,—the Jewish fondness for signs, and the arrogant philosophy of the Greeks, but never to a mystical tendency which would depreciate the historical facts of Christianity. Against a tendency of this kind, he would certainly have argued in a very different manner.

The sensuous tendency of the Jewish spirit we should expect to meet with in the Jewish part of the Corinthian church, the pride of philosophy in those who attached themselves to Apollos, since from what has been said we must suppose that there was a distinct party composed of such persons. As Paul when he spoke against the Grecian pride of philosophy, had this party of Apollos specially in his mind, by a natural transition he spoke in the next place of his relation to Apollos.

The passage in 2 Cor. xi. 4 has been adduced to prove that Paul's opponents had preached another Christ and another gospel. Paul reproached the Corinthians with having given themselves up to such erroneous teachers. But in that whole section he occupies himself, not with combating a false doctrine, as he must have done if the representatives of a mysticism that undermined the foundations of the Christian faith had been his opponents; but he had only to combat the pretensions of persons who wished to make their own authority supreme in the Corinthian church, and not to acknowledge him as an apostle. These people themselves, he says in this connexion, could not deny, that he had performed everything which could be required of an apostle as founder of a Church, for he had preached to them the gospel of Jesus the Crucified and the Risen, and had communicated to them the powers of the Holy Spirit by his ministry. With justice these persons, he said, might appear against him, and assume the management of the church, if they could really show that there was another Jesus than the one announced by Paul, another gospel than that which he proclaimed, or another Holy Spirit than that whose powers had been efficient among them.*

* I account for the irregularity in the "might bear," ἀνείχεσθε, 2 Cor. xi. 4, in this way,—that Paul was penetrated with the conviction, that the case, which in form he had assumed to be possible, was in fact impossible. This fourth verse is thus connected with the preceding; I fear that you have departed from Christian simplicity; for if it were not so, you could not have allowed yourselves to be governed by persons who could impart to you nothing but what you have received from me; for I consider (v. 5) myself to stand behind the chief apostles in no respect. By this analysis, the objections of De Wette, p. 237, against this interpretation are at once obviated. Against the other mode of explanation, I have to object that it does not suit the connexion with v. 5; that the words would then be unnecessarily multiplied; that Paul would then hardly have used the words "ye receive another spirit," πνεῦμα ἕτερον λαμβάνετε, which refer only to the receiving the Holy Spirit. I also think that he would then have said, not Ἰησοῦν, but Χριστὸν, for these mystics would rather have preached another Christ than this historical

The opponents of this view of the passage believe, like many others, that those who call themselves *οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ* are mentioned by Paul himself in 2 Cor. x. 7. But here only such can be understood as boasted of a special inward connexion with Christ. But I do not perceive why the epithet should not be applied to every person who thought that in any sense they particularly belonged to Christ, or could boast of any special connexion with him. From the expression "after the outward appearance," *κατὰ πρόσωπον**, it is clear that these persons boasted of an outward connexion with Christ, which certainly would not suit the representatives of a mystical tendency. Indeed, throughout the whole section he distinguishes the opponents of whom he is speaking, as those who wished to establish a purely outward preëminence (2 Cor. xi. 18), founded on their Jewish descent, and their connexion with the apostles chosen by Christ himself, and with the original church in Palestine. Would Paul, if he had to do with such idealizing mystics, have conceded to them, even for the time only, that they stood in connexion with Christ, that they could call themselves his servants? Would he not from the first have made it a question whether it was the true Christ after whom they called themselves? And how can it be imagined that Paul, if his opponents were of this class, would have used expressions which are directed rather against the sensuous perversion of the religious sentiment, and might easily be misinterpreted in favor of that false spiritualism? Would he have said, "Yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more; but only a spiritual Christ who is exalted above all limited earthly relations, with whom we can now enter into communion in a spiritual manner, since we have a share in the new spiritual creation proceeding from him;" 2 Cor. v. 16, 17.†

When Paul appealed to the revelations imparted to him, it was not for the confutation of those who supported themselves only by such inward experiences; but of those principally who would not acknowledge him as a genuine apostle, equal to those who were chosen by Christ during his earthly life,—the same persons, against whom he maintained his independent apostolic commission, as delivered to him by Christ on his personal appearance to him; 1 Cor. ix. 1, 2.

person Jesus; or as, at a later period, the Gnostics, who held similar notions, taught that there was not a twofold Jesus, but a twofold Christ, or distinguished between a heavenly Christ and a human Jesus. On the contrary, according to the interpretation which I have followed, Paul would of course say, "another *Jesus* than the one I preach," referring to an historical personage, and the events of his life.

* A comparison of the passage in 2 Cor. v. 12, (where the *ἐν προσώπῳ* is opposed to *καρδίᾳ*), appears to me to prove that the words must be so understood; the antithesis of the outward and inward is quite in Paul's style.

† These words contain a contrast to his former Jewish convictions, and his earlier conception of the character of the Messiah; also to all that was antecedent to Christianity, and independent of it; for from this point of view all things must in some measure become new.

Had he been called to oppose the tendency of a false mysticism and spiritualism, he, who understood so well how to strike at the root of error and delusion, would have certainly entered more fully into conflict with such an erroneous direction of the religious sentiment, one so dangerous to genuine Christianity; and he would have had the best opportunity for this in treating of the gifts of the Spirit.

We must then consider this view of the Christ-party as entirely unsupported by the epistle of Paul, and only deduced from it by a number of arbitrary interpretations.* While those whose views we are opposing, trace the origin of such a party to a certain tendency of Judaism, we, on the contrary, are obliged to refer it to a Grecian element.

From the peculiar qualities of the Grecian mind, which was not disposed to submit itself to an objective authority, but readily moulded everything in a manner conformable to its own subjectivity, such a tendency as that we have been speaking of, might easily proceed.† At that time, there were many educated and half-educated individuals, who were dissatisfied with the popular polytheism. These persons listened to the words of Christ, which impressed them by their sublimity and spirituality, and believed that in him they had met with a reformer of the religious condition of mankind, such as they had been longing for. We have already remarked, that a collection of the memorable actions and discourses of Christ, had most probably been in circulation from a very early period. Might they not have procured such a document, and then constructed by means of it, a peculiar form of Christian doctrine, modelled according to their Grecian subjectivity? These persons probably belonged to the class of the wisdom-seeking Greeks, at which, although the Christian church made little progress among the higher classes, we need not be surprised, since in this city a certain degree of culture was almost universal; and from the words which tell us, that in the Corinthian church, *not many* of the philosophically trained, *not many* of the highest class were to be found, we may infer, that *some* such persons must have belonged to it; one individual is mentioned in Romans xvi. 23, who filled an important civil office in Corinth.‡

But against this supposition, the same objections may be urged, which we made against another view of the Christ-party, that Paul has

* I find no ground for a comparison with Montanism, Marcion, and the Clementines, and I must consider as arbitrary the explanations that have been given of the first epistle of Clemens Romanus (to which, too, I cannot ascribe so high an antiquity), in order to elucidate the affairs of the Corinthian church in the times of the apostle Paul.

† The reasons alleged by Baur, in his late Essay on this subject, why such a form of error could not exist at this time, do not convince me.

‡ Baur says (l. c. p. 11), "Religion, not philosophy, led to Christianity." But it is not altogether improbable, that a person at that time might have been led by a religious interest, which could find no satisfaction in the popular religion, to philosophy, and by the same interest be carried onward to Christianity, without adopting it in its unalloyed simplicity. Why should not such phenomena, which certainly occurred in the second century, have arisen from the same causes at this period?

not specially directed his argumentation against the principles of such a party, though they threatened even more than those of other parties to injure apostolic Christianity. Still what he says on other occasions, respecting the only source of the knowledge of truths that rest on divine Revelation; and against the presumption of unenlightened reason, setting herself up as an arbitress of divine things; and on the nothingness of a proud philosophy, (1 Cor. ii. 11,) forms the most powerful argumentation against the fundamental error of this party, even if he did not have it specially in view; and it is a never-failing characteristic of the apostle's mode of controversy, that he seizes hold of the main roots of error, instead of busying himself too much (as was the practice of later ecclesiastical polemics) with its branches and offsets. Nor is it altogether improbable, that the adherents of this party were not numerous, and exercised only a slight influence in the church. They occupied too remote a position to receive much benefit from the warnings and arguments of Paul, and he had only to set the church on its guard against an injurious intercourse with such persons. "Be not deceived," said he; "evil communications corrupt good manners." 1 Cor. xv. 33.

If this view be thought too venturesome, since in the two Epistles to the Corinthians no other distinct trace of a direct conflict with such a party can be found, it only remains to be said, that there were certain persons, *οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, of whom Paul knew nothing worse than that, instead of making common cause with all those whom they ought to have acknowledged as members of the one body of Christ, they made even their wishing to belong to Christ alone an affair of party, and so instead of putting an end to all party feeling by a reference to Christ, created a fourth party, which by its opposition to the other parties would be hurried unavoidably into much that was one-sided and erroneous. We should find the first appearance of this kind in the fact, that the wishing to join themselves to no party was made an affair of party. And thus by the reference to such a party, Paul might have been led to say, Is Christ divided? that they could think of calling themselves alone after Christ, and dare appropriate to themselves a name that belonged to all. In this way a better explanation would be obtained, how it is that no further distinct reference to such a party occurs in his epistles.

The opposition between the Pauline and Petrine parties, or the Jewish and Gentile Christians, was, in reference to the relations of life, the strongest of all these party differences, and gave rise to many separate controversies. The Jews and Jewish Christians when they lived in intercourse with the heathen, suffered much disquietude, if unawares they partook of any food which had been rendered unclean by its connexion with idolatrous rites. Various rules were laid down by the Jewish theologians to determine what was, and what was not defiling, and various methods were devised for guarding against such defilement, on which much may be found in the Talmud. Now, as persons might easily run a risk of buying in the market portions of the flesh of

animals which had been offered in sacrifice, or might have such set before them in houses where they were guests, their daily life was harassed with constant perplexities. But scruples on this point were probably found, not merely in those who were avowedly among the Judaizing opponents of Paul, but they also disturbed many Christians of weaker minds. As faith in their false gods had previously exercised great influence over them, so they could not altogether divest themselves of an impression, that beings whom they had so lately revered as deities, were something more than creatures of the imagination. But from their new point of view, this reflection of their ancient belief assumed a peculiar form. As the whole system of heathenism was in their eyes the kingdom of darkness, their deities were now transformed into evil spirits, and they feared lest, by partaking of the flesh consecrated to them,* they should come into fellowship with evil spirits.† That these scruples affected not merely Judaizers, but other Christians also, is evident from a case in reference to which Paul gives specific directions. He supposes the example, that such weak believers were guests at the table of a heathen.‡ Now we may be certain, that none who belonged to the Judaizers could have made up their minds to eat with a heathen.§

* Thus Peter, in the Clementines, says to the heathens: Προφύσει τῶν λεγομένων ιεροθυτῶν χαλεπῶν δαιμόνων ἐμπίπλασθε. (Under pretext of the so-called sacrifices ye are filled with cruel demons.) Hom. xi. § 15.

† The passage in 1 Cor. viii. 7, might, it is true, be understood of persons who, though they had passed over to Christian monotheism, were still in some measure entangled in polytheism, and could not entirely free themselves from the belief that the gods whom they had formerly served were divinities of a subordinate class; so that now such persons—since by partaking of the flesh of the victims they supposed that they entered again into connexion with these divine beings—would be led to imagine, that their former idolatry was not wholly incompatible with Christianity, and thus might easily form an amalgamation of heathenism and Christianity. In later times, something of this kind we allow took place, in the transition from polytheism to monotheism; but in this primitive age, Christianity came at once into such direct conflict on these particulars with heathenism, that an amalgamation of this kind cannot be thought natural. Whoever had not wholly renounced idolatry would certainly not have been received into the Christian church, nor would Paul have so mildly passed judgment on *such* a weakness of faith. From such passages as Gal. v. 20, 1 Cor. vi. 9, we cannot conclude with certainty that, among such as had professed Christianity, there were those who, after they had been led to Christianity by a superficial impression, allowed themselves again to join in the worship of idols; for Paul might here have designedly classed the vices he named with idolatry, to indicate that whoever indulged in them deserved to be ranked with idolaters. If we compare these passages with 1 Cor. v. 11, it will appear that some such instances occurred of a relapse into idolatry, but that those who were thus guilty of participating in idolatry were to be excluded from all Christian communion.

‡ The scrupulosity of the Jews in this respect appears in the Jewish-Christian work of the Clementines (though on other points sufficiently liberal), where the following words are ascribed to the apostle Peter: Τραπεζῆς ἐθνῶν οὐκ ἀπολαύομεν, ἅτε δὴ οὐδὲ συνεστιάσθαι αὐτοῖς δυνάμενοι διὰ τὸ ἀκαθάρτως αὐτοὺς βιοῦν. (We do not partake at the table of the heathen, for we are not able to eat with them on account of their unclean manner of living.) No exception could be made in favor of parents, children, brothers, or sisters.

§ By the "any one," τὶς, 1 Cor. x. 28, we cannot on account of the relation of the first

Those who in their own estimation were Pauline Christians, ridiculing a scrupulosity that thus made daily life uneasy, fell into an opposite error. They had indeed formed right conceptions of the Pauline principles in theory, but erred in the application, because the spirit of love and of wisdom was wanting. They said, "Idols are in themselves nothing—mere creatures of the imagination—hence also the eating of the flesh that has been devoted to them is a thing in itself indifferent. The Christian is bound by no law in such outward or indifferent things; all things are free to him; "all things are lawful," πάντα ἔξεστιν, was their motto. They appealed to their knowledge, to the power which they possessed as Christians; γνῶσις, ἐξουσία, were their watchwords. They had no consideration for the necessities of their weaker brethren; they easily seduced many among them to follow their example from false shame, that they might not be ridiculed as narrow-minded and scrupulous; such an one, who allowed himself to be induced by outward considerations to act contrary to his convictions, would afterwards be disturbed in his conscience. "Thus," said Paul, "through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish for whom Christ died."* Many went such lengths in this pride of knowledge, and this abuse of Christian freedom, that they scrupled not to take part in the festive entertainments, consisting of the flesh that was left after the sacrifices had been presented, which the heathen were wont to give their friends; and thus they were easily carried on to indulge in those immoral excesses, which by the decrees of the apostolic convention at Jerusalem had been forbidden in connexion with the prohibition of flesh sacrificed to idols. In fact, we here find the germ of a one-sided over-valuation of theoretic illumination, a misunderstanding of Christian freedom, a false adiaphorism in morals, which a later pseudo-Pauline gnostic† tendency carried so far as to justify the grossest immoralities. But such wickedness certainly cannot be laid to the charge of the perverters of Christian freedom at Cor-

ν. 27, understand as meant the same person, the heathen host,—and it would be a very unlikely thing that such a person would remind his Christian guest, that he had set before him meat that had been offered to idols; but we must rather refer it to the weak Christian, who considered it to be his duty to warn his unscrupulous brother against partaking of such food, the same weak Christian whose conscience is spoken of in v. 29.

* We might here make use of the words attributed to Christ, taken from an apocryphal gospel, and quoted in Luke vi. 4, by the Codex Cantab. See Life of Christ, p. 92.

† As was the case with those whom Porphyry mentions in his book *De Abstinencia Carnis*, i. § 43, who in their mode of expression agree very remarkably with the unscrupulous persons described by Paul: Οὐ γὰρ ἡμᾶς μολύνει τὰ βρώματα (said they), ὥσπερ οὐδὲ τὴν θάλατταν τὸ ρυπαρὸν τῶν βρυμάτων, κυριεύομεν (like the Corinthian ἐξουσιάζομεν) γὰρ τῶν ἀπάντων, καθάπερ ἡ θάλασσα τῶν ὑγρῶν πάντων. Ἐὰν εὐλαβήθωμεν βρώσιν, ἐδουλώθημεν τῷ τοῦ φόβου φρονήματι, δεῖ δὲ πάνθ' ἡμῖν ὑποτετάχθαι. (For bread defiles us no more than the dirt of the streams defiles the sea, for we have power over all things even as the sea over all waters. Now if we were scrupulous as to meats, we should be enslaved to the spirit of fear; but it is necessary that all things be subject to us.) They appeal to their βυθὸς ἐξουσίας.

inth. Though the heathen corruption of morals had infected many members of the Corinthian church, yet they were far from wishing to justify this immorality on such grounds; and had this been the case, Paul would have spoken with far greater severity against such a palliation of sin.*

The opposition between the Petrine and Pauline parties had probably an influence on the different views of the married and single life. It was indeed the peculiar effect of Christianity, that it elevated all the moral relations based in human nature, in their pure human form, to a higher significance, so that—after the original Fountain of Divine life had once assumed humanity, in order, by revealing himself in it, to sanctify and glorify it—the striving after the godlike was no more to show itself in an unearthly direction, overstepping the bounds of human nature, but everywhere the Divine was itself to be made human; the divine life was to reveal itself in the forms of human development. Yet, as at first, before the elevating and all-penetrating influence of Christianity had

* The departure to so great an extent from theoretical Christian truth in the church at Corinth, has been admitted by many, owing to a misunderstanding of the apostle's language. They have been led to entertain this opinion, from believing that there is a strict objective connexion between what Paul says in 1 Cor. vi. 12, and in the beginning of v. 13, and what he says of the words τὸ δὲ σῶμα, and from supposing that from v. 12, he had the same thought in view. But a comparison of vi. 12 with x. 23 will show that Paul at first meant only to speak of the partaking of the meat offered to idols, and to explain the subject more fully. With this reference, he had said in v. 13, the food and the stomach, whose wants it satisfies, are both transitory, designed only for this earthly existence. On these things the essence of the Christian calling, which relates to the eternal and the heavenly, cannot depend; compare 1 Cor. viii. 8; Rom. xiv. 17; Matt. xv. 17; and thus he was led to the contrast, "but this *form* alone of the body is transitory." According to its nature, the body is designed to be an imperishable organ devoted to the Lord, which will be awakened again in a nobler glorified form for a higher existence. It must, therefore, be even now withdrawn from the service of lust, and be formed into a sanctified organ belonging to the Lord. It might be that there was floating in the apostle's mind a possible misunderstanding of his words, against which he wished to guard, or his controversy with the deniers of the doctrine of the resurrection at Corinth. In either case he was prompted to leave the topic with which he began, and to speak against those excesses in the Corinthian church of which he had not thought at first. And this again led him to answer the questions proposed to him respecting the relation of the sexes. After that he returns again, at the beginning of the eighth chapter, to the subject of "things offered to idols," but from another point; and after several digressions to other subjects, which may easily be explained from association of ideas, he began again, in ch. x. 23, the exposition of his sentiments in the same form as in ch. vi. 12. What Billroth has said in his Commentary, p. 83, against this interpretation, that thus we lose the evident contrast and parallelism between the words, "Meats for the belly, and the belly for meats;" and "the body not for fornication, but for the Lord, and the Lord for the body," (τὰ βρώματα τῇ κοιλίᾳ, καὶ ἡ κοιλία τοῖς βρώμασι, and τὸ δὲ σῶμα οὐ τῇ πορνείᾳ, ἀλλὰ τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ ὁ κύριος τῷ σώματι) appears without foundation. It is only assumed that Paul expressed this contrast from a more general view of the subject, and without limiting it to a perversion of the doctrine of Christian liberty, actually existing in the church. What De Wette has lately advanced in his commentary against this interpretation has not altered my views, though I have examined with pleasure the reasons advanced by this distinguished critic.

manifested itself in all the relations of life, the earnest moral spirit of the gospel came into conflict with a world under the dominion of sinful lusts; so, for a short time, an ascetic tendency averse to the marriage union (which though not in accordance with the spirit of Christianity, might be called forth in opposition to the corruption of the world) would easily make its appearance, especially since there was an expectation of the speedy passing away of all earthly things, antecedent to the perfect development of the kingdom of God. The conviction that ere the kingdom of God will attain its perfection, the earthly life of mankind must in all its forms be penetrated by the life of the kingdom of God, and that all these forms are to be made vehicles of its manifestation—this conviction could be arrived at only by degrees from the historical course of development. And as to what concerns marriage especially, Christ, certainly, by presenting the idea of it as a moral union—requisite for the complete development of the type of humanity as transformed by the divine principle of life, and thus also for the realization of the kingdom of God in it—a moral union of the sexes, designed for their mutual complement, had at once disowned the ascetic contempt of marriage, which views it only on its sensuous side, and rejects its true idea as realized in the divine life. Yet till Christianity had penetrated more into the life of humanity, and thereby had realized this idea of marriage as a peculiar form of manifestation belonging to the kingdom of God, zeal for that kingdom might have viewed marriage as a relation tending to distract the mind, and to withdraw it from that one fundamental direction. And besides, though the Christian view, in all its purity and completeness, was in direct opposition to the ascetic overvaluation of celibacy, yet Christianity was equally repugnant to the ancient Jewish notion, according to which celibacy was considered as a disgrace and a curse. As Christianity made everything depend on the *disposition*, as it presented the means of salvation and improvement for all conditions of human kind, and a higher life which was destined to find its way into all states of suffering humanity, and open a source of happiness under suffering; so it also taught that a single life, where circumstances rendered it necessary, might be sanctified and ennobled by its relation to the kingdom of God, and become a peculiar means for the furtherance of that object.* As Christianity taught men to recognise the realization of the kingdom of God in humanity as its highest moral attainment—the highest good to which everything else was to be referred,

* Compare Matt. xix. 11, 12; Life of Christ, p. 330. If we think of the desolations that took place at the fall of the Roman empire, and the national migrations—how important was it for such times that Christianity should allow a point of view from which a single life might be esteemed as a charism, even though this point of view was adopted with ascetic one-sidedness. How important that that which was occasioned by the pressure of circumstances could be made a means of blessing (by the education of the rude nations effected by the monkish orders.) See the brief but valuable remarks of a dear and honored man, F. v. Meyer, in his review of Olshausen's Commentary.

so also it caused marriage and the family constitution to be regarded as something on the whole belonging to the moral office of humanity, and to the representation of the kingdom of God; but it also acknowledged cases, in virtue of a disposition that subordinated all other things to the kingdom of God, in which the individual moral functions of a life devoted to spreading the kingdom of God might involve an exception to the general office, as is denoted by *εὐνουχισμὸς διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν*. (Matt. xix. 12.)

Thus Christianity had to maintain a conflict in the Corinthian church with two opposing one-sided tendencies of the moral sentiment,—the ascetic over-valuation of celibacy, and the tendency which would enforce marriage as an unconditional, universal law, without admitting that variety of the social relations, under which the kingdom of God is capable of exhibiting itself.

The first tendency certainly did not proceed from the Judaizing section of the church, for those apostles to whose authority the Petrine party specially appealed, were married; and took their wives with them on their missionary journeys; 1 Cor. ix. 5; besides, such ascetism was totally foreign to their national customs. From the Hebrew point of view a fruitful marriage appeared as a peculiar blessing and honor; while unmarried life, or a childless marriage, was esteemed a disgrace. Though by the feeling of sadness at the passing away of the glory of the ancient Theocracy, and of dissatisfaction with the existing religion, and by the infusion of foreign oriental elements, ascetic tendencies were produced in the later Judaizers; still the spirit of the original Hebrew* system made itself felt, and counteracted to a certain extent the ascetic tendencies, both in Judaism and Christianity.† But among the Pauline party, an over-valuation of the single life more or less prevailed, and in this respect they thought themselves countenanced by the example of their apostle. The Judaizers, on the other hand, adhered to the ancient Hebrew principles, as uncompromising opponents of celibacy.‡

* Hence also the ascetic tendency of the Essenes was corrected by a party who introduced marriage into this sect.

† This opposition still showed itself among the later descendants of the Judaizers of this age. Thus in the Clementines, it is given as the characteristic of a true prophet: "that he regards marriage as lawful, that he concedes temperate pleasures," *γάμον νομιτεύει, ἐγκράτειαν συγχωρεῖ*, Hom. iii. § 16. It is enjoined on the overseers of the church, § 68: "that they urge the marriage not only of young men, but also of the more advanced," *νέων μὴ μόνον κατεπειγέτωσαν τοὺς γάμους, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν προβεβηκότων*. Epiphanius says of that class of Ebionites whom he describes, that they reject "celibacy," *παρθενία*; "they compel and even at an unsuitable age they marry the young men by the direction, forsooth, of their teachers," *ἀναγκάζουσι δὲ καὶ παρ' ἡλικίαν ἐκγαμίζουσι τοὺς νέους ἐξ ἐπιτροπῆς δῆθεν τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς διδασκάλων*. Similar things are found in the religious books of the Zabians against monkery.

‡ When Paul in 1 Cor. vii. 40, recommends celibacy in certain cases, he appears to have in view the Judaizers, who set themselves against an apostolic authority: for in the words "and I think also that I have the spirit of God," *δοκῶ δὲ καὶ γὰρ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἔχειν*,

Opposition to the rigidity of Judaism, and that false liberalism which actuated many, disposed them to break through several wholesome moral restraints. It was maintained, and with justice, that Christianity had broken down the wall of separation between the sexes, in reference to the concerns of the higher life,* and had freed woman from her state of servitude. But, seduced by the spirit of false freedom, individuals had been led to overstep the limits prescribed by nature and sound morals, and recognised and rendered sacred also by Christianity. Women, contrary to the customs prevalent among the Greeks,† appeared in the Christian assemblies unveiled, and, putting themselves on an equality with the men, assumed the office of public teachers.‡

The want of Christian love was also evinced by the disputes that arose respecting property, which the parties were not willing to decide, as had hitherto been customary in the Jewish and Christian churches, by arbitrators chosen from among themselves; these Gentile Christians, boastful of their freedom, set aside the scruples which restrained Jewish Christians, and appealed without hesitation to a heathen tribunal.

By this defect in the spirit of Christian love, those religious feasts which were particularly fitted to represent the loving communion of Christians, and to maintain its vigor, lost their true significance, those Christian Agapæ, which accompanied and formed a part of the celebration of the Last Supper.§ These love-feasts were designed to show the power of Christian fellowship in overcoming all the differences of rank and education; rich and poor, masters and slaves were to partake with one another of the same simple meal. But in the Corinthian church, where these differences were so strongly marked, this could not be attained. There existed among the Greeks an ancient custom of holding entertainments, at which each one brought his food with him, and consumed it alone.|| The Agapæ in the Corinthian church were conducted on the plan of this ancient custom, although the peculiar object of the institution was so different; consequently, the distinction of rich and poor was rendered peculiarly prominent, and the rich sometimes indulged in excesses which desecrated the character of these meetings.

he appears to contradict those who believed and asserted that they alone had the Spirit of God.

* Gal. iii. 28, "there is neither male nor female in Christ Jesus," οὐκ ἐνὶ ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. On the contrary, Aristotle says, "woman is inferior to man," *Χεῖρον ἢ γυνὴ τοῦ ἀνδρός*, Magn. Ethic. i. 34, ed. Bekker, p. 1194.

† This appears to me the most simple and natural interpretation. What has been said by some respecting the difference of the Roman and Greek customs of *aperto* or *operto capite sacra facere*, seems hardly applicable here.

‡ See p. 149.

§ See p. 165.

|| See *Xenoph. Memorabil.* iii. 14. The *συμπόσια φιλικὰ* bore a greater resemblance to the Agapæ. At these feasts all that each brought was made a part of a common meal, which the chronicler Johannes Malala mentions as continuing to be practised even in his time. See vii. *Chronograph. e collect.* Niebuhr. p. 180.

The Grecian mode of thinking and culture predominant in the Corinthian church appeared in their zeal for mutual discourse in their public assemblies, and for the cultivation of those charisms which related to oral religious instruction;* but it took a one-sided direction, which showed its baneful influence at a later period in the Greek church, an aspiring rather after extraordinary power in discourse, than after a life of eminent practical godliness.† This unpractical tendency, and the want of an all-animating and guiding love, were also shown in their mode of valuing and applying the various kinds of charisms which related to public speaking; in their one-sided over-valuation of gifts they sought for the more striking and dazzling, such as speaking in new tongues, in preference to those that were more adapted to general edification.‡

To which of the parties in the Corinthian church the opponents of the doctrine of the resurrection belonged cannot be determined with certainty, since we have no precise account of their peculiar tenets. No other source of information is left open to us than that which may be inferred from the objections against the doctrine of the resurrection which Paul seems to presuppose, and from the reasons alleged by him in its favor, and adapted to the arguments by which they assailed it. But no safe result can be derived from these. For as to the former, Paul might have constructed these objections (as he had often done on other occasions when developing an important subject) without our being authorized to infer that they were exactly the objections which had been urged by the impugnors of the doctrine. And as to the latter, in his mode of establishing the doctrine, he might have followed the connexion with other Christian truths in which this article of faith presented itself to his own mind, without being influenced by the peculiar mode of the opposition made to it.

When Paul, for example, adduces the evidence for the truth of the resurrection of Christ, it cannot be inferred that his Corinthian opponents denied the resurrection of Christ; for without regard to their mode of opposition, he might have adopted this line of argument, because to his own mind faith in the resurrection of Christ was the foundation of faith in the resurrection of the redeemed. He generally joins together the doctrines of the resurrection and of immortality, and hence some may infer that his opponents generally denied personal immortality. But still it remains a question whether Paul possessed exact information respecting the sentiments of these persons, or whether he was not governed by the connexion in which the truths of the Christian faith were presented to his own mind, and by the fact of his habitually finding in

* See 1 Cor. i. 5.

† Paul reminds them, in 1 Cor. iv. 20, that a participation in the kingdom of God is shown, not in high-sounding words, but in the power of the life.

‡ See p. 142.

the opponents of the doctrines of the resurrection those also of the doctrine of immortality, since both stood or fell together in the Jewish polemical theology.

This controversy on the resurrection has been attributed to the ordinary opponents of that doctrine among the Jews, the Sadducees, and it has hence been concluded that they belonged to the Judaizing party in the Corinthian church. This supposition appears to be confirmed by the circumstance that Paul particularly mentions, as witnesses for the truth of Christ's resurrection, Peter and James, who were the most distinguished authorities of the Judaizing party; but this cannot be esteemed a proof, for he must on any supposition have laid special weight on the testimony of the apostles collectively, and of these in particular, on account of the repeated appearance of Christ to them after his resurrection. Had he thought of the Sadducees, he would have joined issue with them on their peculiar mode of reasoning from the alleged silence of the Pentateuch;* just as Christ opposed them on this ground. Besides, we nowhere find an example of the mingling of Sadduceeism and Christianity, and as they present no points of connexion with one another, such an amalgamation is in the highest degree improbable.

A similar reply must be made to those who imagine that the controversy on the doctrine of the resurrection, and the denial of that of immortality, may be explained from a mingling of the Epicurean notions with Christianity. Yet the passages in 1 Cor. xv. 32—35, might certainly seem to favor this view, if we consider the practical consequence deduced by Paul from that denial of the resurrection as a position laid down in the sense of the Epicureans, if we find in that passage a warning against their God-forgetting levity, and against the infectious example of the lax morals which were the offspring of their unbelief. And the objection, moreover, would not apply with equal force to this view as to the first.† From the delicacy and mobility of the Grecian character, so susceptible of all kinds of impressions, we can more easily imagine such a mixture of contradictory mental elements and such inconsistency, than from the stiffness of Jewish nationality, and the strict, dogmatic, decided nature of Sadduceeism. To this may be added, that the spirit of the times, so very much disposed to Eclecticism and Syncretism, tended to bring nearer one another and to amalgamate modes of thinking that, at a different period, would have stood in most direct and violent opposition. Meanwhile it is difficult to find in Christianity, whether viewed on the doctrinal or ethical side, anything which could attract a person devoted to the Epicurean philosophy, and induce him to include the Christian in his Syncretism, unless by that term we understand something having no reference to all the remaining peculiarities of Christianity, and relating only to the idea of a monotheistic, universal

* An argument which will not be admitted by all. See *Life of Christ*, p. 36. n.

† As Baur correctly remarks in his *Essay on the Christ-party*, p. 81.

religion, in opposition to the popular superstitions, and to certain moral ideas detached from their connexion with the whole system ; but this would be at least not very probable, and might more easily happen in an age when Christianity had long been fermenting in the general mind, rather than on its first appearance in the heathen world. All history, too, testifies against this supposition ; for we always see the Epicurean philosophy in hostility to Christianity, and never in the first ages do we find any approximation of the two systems. As to the only passage which may appear to favor this view, 1 Cor. xv. 32—35, it is not clear that the opponents of the doctrine of the resurrection had really brought forward the maxims here stated. It might be, that Paul here intended only to characterise that course of life which it appeared to him must proceed from the consistent carrying out of a philosophy that denied the destination of man to eternal life ; for the idea of eternal life and of the reality of a striving directed to eternal things were to him correlative ideas. And when persons who had made a profession of Christianity could fall into a denial of eternal life, it appeared to him as an infatuation of mind proceeding from “sin,” *ἀμαρτία*, and hurrying a man away to sinful practice ; a forgetfulness of God, or the mark of a state of estrangement from God in which a man knows nothing of God. It is much more probable, that philosophically educated Gentile Christians were prejudiced against the doctrine of the resurrection on another ground, as in later times ; the common rude conception of this doctrine which Paul particularly combated probably gave rise to many such prejudices. The questionings as to how such a body as the present can be united to the soul in a higher condition, and how a body which has sunk into corruption can be restored again, would perfectly suit the views of a Gentile Christian, who had received a certain philosophical training, although it cannot be affirmed with certainty, as has been before stated, that precisely these objections were brought forward in the present instance. And if we are justified in supposing that by the Christ-party is meant one that, from certain expressions of Christ which they explained according to their subjective proclivities, constructed a peculiar philosophical Christianity, it would be most probable that such persons formed an idea of a resurrection only in a spiritual sense, and explained in this manner the expressions of Christ himself relating to the resurrection ; as we must in any case assume that those who wished to be Christians and yet denied the future resurrection, were far removed from the true standard of Christian doctrine in other respects, and had indulged in arbitrary explanations of such of the discourses of Christ as they were acquainted with.

It may be asked, where, and in what manner did Paul receive the first accounts of these disturbances in the Corinthian church ? From several expressions of Paul in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians,* it

* Between which and the First Epistle, Paul could have taken no journey to Corinth

appears, that when he wrote his admonitory epistle, he had been there again, but only for a very short time, and that he must have had many painful experiences of the disorders among them, though they might not all have appeared during his visit.*

and already in the First Epistle, as we shall presently see, there is a passage which must be most naturally referred to a preceding second journey to that city.

* I must now declare myself, after repeated examinations, more decidedly than in the first edition, in favor of the view maintained by Bleek in his valuable Essay in the *Theologischen Studien und Kritiken*, 1830, part iii., which has since been approved by Rückert, by Schott, in his discussion of some important chronological points in the history of the apostle Paul, Jena, 1832, and by Credner, in his Introduction to the New Testament, and by others. Though some of the passages adduced as evidence for this opinion admit of another interpretation, yet, taken altogether, they establish the second visit of Paul to this church as an undeniable fact. The passage in 2 Cor. xii. 14, compared with v. 13, we must naturally understand to mean, that, as he had already stayed twice at Corinth without receiving the means of support from the church, he was resolved on his third visit to be no more a burden to them than on the two former occasions. If verse 14 be understood to mean (a sense, of which the words will admit), that being a third time ready, he is intending to come to them, we must in the first place supply what is not expressly said, that he will now certainly execute this resolution, and then the words so understood do not quite suit the connexion. According to the most approved reading of 2 Cor. ii. 1, the "again," *πάλιν*, must be referred to the whole clause "to come in heaviness," *ἐν λύπῃ ἔλθειν*, and then it follows, that Paul had already *once* received a painful impression from the Corinthians in a visit made to them, which cannot refer to his first residence among them, and therefore obliges us to suppose a second already past. In the passage 2 Cor. xii. 21, which cannot therefore here be brought in proof, it is doubtless possible, and, according to the position of the words, is most natural, to connect the "again," *πάλιν*, with "coming," *ἐλθόντα*; but it is also allowable to suppose that the "again" belongs to "will humble," *ταπεινώσῃ*, but is placed first for emphasis. In this case, there is better ground for the introduction of the "again," which moreover is not added to "when I come," in v. 20, as well as for the position of the whole clause *πάλιν ἐλθόντα*; and the connexion with what follows favors this interpretation. Paul in v. 21, expresses his anxiety lest God should humble him a second time among them when he came. Accordingly, we must thus understand xiii. 1, following the simplest interpretation, though this passage may be otherwise understood, (it is supposed, for instance, to mean, that as he had already twice announced his intended coming to Corinth, having now a third time repeated his threatening, he would certainly execute it): "I am now about to come to you a third time, and as what is supported by two or three witnesses must be valid, so now what I have threatened a second and a third time will certainly be fulfilled. I have (when I was with you a second time) before told those who had sinned, and all the rest, and I tell them a second time beforehand, as if I were with you—though I now (this *now* is opposed to formerly, since when present among them, he had expressed the same sentiments,) am absent,—that if I come to you again, I will not act towards you with forbearance," (as Paul, when he came to them a second time, still behaved with forbearance, though he had already sufficient cause for dissatisfaction with them.) De Wette, indeed, objects to this interpretation, that the mention of the first visit of Paul to Corinth would be in this case quite superfluous. But if, during his second visit, he had not acted with severity towards the Corinthians, but intended to do so on this third occasion, because they had not listened to his admonitions, he had certainly good reason for mentioning his two first visits together, to mark more distinctly in what respect the third would be distinguished from the other two. And though, during his first residence among them, his experience was on the whole pleasing, yet in this long period many things must have happened with which he

Owing to the breaks in the narrative of the Acts, it is difficult to decide *when* this second visit to Corinth took place. If the Second Epistle to the Corinthians had not been addressed at the same time to the churches in Achaia, we might suppose that Paul, during his long residence at Corinth, had taken missionary or visitation journeys throughout other parts of Achaia, and that he then once more returned to Corinth, only for a short time, in order to fetch Aquila for the journeys he had in prospect. It appears that on this journey he was exposed to many dangers, and that on his deliverance from them he made the vow mentioned above. But since the second epistle was also directed to the churches in Achaia, this supposition, in order to be maintained, must be so modified, that Paul could have made in the meantime another longer journey, and returned back again to Achaia—which is not easy to admit. Or we must suppose, that during his longer residence at Ephesus, of which we are now speaking, he undertook another missionary journey, and called in passing at Corinth; or that, by the anxiety which the news brought from Corinth excited in his mind, he was induced to go thither from Ephesus, but on account of circumstances which called him back to Ephesus, he could stay only a short time with the Corinthian church, and therefore gave them notice of a longer residence among them. But it does not well agree with this last supposition, that Paul distinguishes this visit as one that took place “by the way.” And especially if it took place not long before the First Epistle, we might the more expect allusions to it in that. The communications between Paul and the Corinthian church seems also to presuppose, that he had not been with them for a considerable time. There remains a third supposition, that the visitation which he made after his departure from Antioch to the churches earlier founded by him (Acts xviii. 23) before he entered on a fresh field of labor, was of greater extent than is directly stated in that passage, and that it extended as far as Achaia. Perhaps he then travelled first from Phrygia towards the coast of the Mediterranean Sea, and then sailed to Hellas. Possibly he then found at Corinth Apollos who had proceeded thither, when Paul coming from Antioch, passed through the upper parts of Asia (Acts xix. 1),* and perhaps joined him on his return, and went with him to Ephesus.

We must therefore at all events suppose that Paul had obtained his

could not be satisfied, but which he treated gently, trusting to the future progress of their Christian life. We may find in the First Epistle, a trace of this his second residence at Corinth. When in 1 Cor. xvi. 7, Paul says, that he intended not now to see them by the way, *ἀπὸ τοῦ* and its position allow us to assume a reference to an earlier visit, which he made only “by the way,” *ἐν παρόδῳ*, and as this was so very transient, we may account for his making no further allusions to it in the first epistle.

* We must in this case interpolate Paul's journey to Corinth, Acts xix. 1, and suppose that since the author of the Acts knew nothing of the wider extent of Paul's visitation at that time, he represented that he immediately betook himself from Upper Asia to Ephesus.

first knowledge of the alteration for the worse in the Corinthian church by his own observation. He could not indeed have witnessed the strife of the various parties; for, as appears from 1 Cor. i. 11, 12, he heard of this first at Ephesus from the report of others. But already he must have had the painful experience that in a church which once was inspired with so much Christian zeal, their old vices and enormities again appeared under a Christian guise. He admonished them for their improvement, and threatened to use severer measures if, when he returned from Ephesus, he should find that no improvement had taken place. At Ephesus he could obtain information respecting the effect of his last admonitions on the church.

But he received worse news than he expected of the corruption of morals in the Corinthian church, and especially of the vicious conduct of an individual who had maintained unlawful intercourse with his step-mother. Hence, in an epistle* he addressed to the Corinthian church, he reproached them with allowing such a man still to remain among them, and required them to renounce all connexion with so abandoned a character.†

It was certainly sufficiently evident what Paul here intended—that the Corinthians should not only exclude from the meetings of the church those who called themselves Christians, while they denied Christianity by their vicious lives, but should also abstain from all kind of intercourse with them, in order to testify emphatically that such a merely outward profession was of no value; to bring these persons to a sense of their guilt; and to declare practically to the heathen world that whoever did not exemplify the Christian doctrine in the conduct of his life, must not

* The epistle in which Paul wrote this could not at any rate be that still retained by the Armenian church, which treats of subjects entirely different, and must be an answer to an earlier epistle of the Corinthians. This pretended epistle to the Corinthians by Paul, and their answer, bear on them, as is now universally acknowledged, the most undeniable marks of spuriousness. The account of the opponents of the doctrine of the resurrection at Corinth, who were thought similar to later deniers of it among the Gentiles, connected with the tales of Simon Magus, and the account of the Jewish founders of sects, by Hegesippus, gave an idle monk the inducement to put together these fragments of Pauline phrases. If they were quoted in a genuine homily of Gregory *Φωτιστής*, they were perhaps in existence in the third century, but this address of Gregory to the newly baptized may itself be spurious.

† It may be asked whether Paul in the lost epistle treated merely of the case which was immediately under consideration in the Corinthian church—only of abstaining from intercourse with *πόρνοις*—or whether he also spoke definitely of such as had fallen into other notorious vices—the covetous, who had no regard for the property of others; the slanderous; those addicted to drinking; those who took any part whatever in the worship of idols. The manner in which he expresses himself in 1 Cor. v. 9–11 might signify, though not decisively, that since he was obliged to guard his words against misapprehension, he took advantage of this opportunity to give a wider application to the principles they expressed, which he certainly had from the beginning in his mind, yet had not occasion to mention in his first epistle, which bore on one particular point. At all events, it is important to know how far Paul extended the strictness of church discipline.

flatter himself that he was a Christian. But since Paul had not thought it necessary to add that he spoke only of the vicious *in the church*, and not of persons in general who lived in such vices, the Corinthians did not think of the limitation which the thing itself might easily have suggested, and thus they were thrown into perplexity how to comply with such an injunction; for how could they, while living in the midst of an evil world, renounce all intercourse with the vicious? They addressed a letter to the apostle, in which they stated their perplexity, and proposed several other questions on doubtful cases in the concerns of the church.

By means of this letter, and the messengers who brought it, he obtained a more complete knowledge of the concerns and state of the church. In the communication which contained his reply to the questions proposed, he poured forth his whole heart, full of paternal love to the church, and entered minutely into all the necessities of their situation. This Epistle, a master-piece of apostolic wisdom in church government, contains much of importance respecting the new form given by Christianity to all the relations of life. It was probably conveyed by the messengers on their return to Corinth.

Paul condemned in an equal degree all party feeling in the Corinthian church. His salutation, in verse 2, was opposed to it, and suited to remind all that they equally belonged to one church, which was composed of all the faithful and redeemed. He taught them that Christ was their sole Head, to whom they must all adhere; that human laborers were to be considered only as instruments, by whom God worked according to their peculiar adaptabilities, in order to promote in the hearts of their fellow-men that result which all things were appointed to serve. They ought to be far from venturing to boast that they had this or that man for their teacher; for such boasting, by which they owned themselves dependent on man, was rather a denial of their being Christians; for if they only, as became Christians, referred everything to Christ, to whom they were indebted for communion with God, they might view all things as designed to serve them, and as belonging to them; those sublime expressions in 1 Cor. iii. 21 show how the truest spiritual freedom and the highest elevation of soul are the offspring of Christian humility. This general truth in reference to the manner in which all Christian teachers (each according to his peculiar qualifications) were to be estimated and made use of, he applies particularly to his relation to Apollos; of whom he could speak most reservedly and unsuspectingly, since he was a man with whom he stood in the closest connexion, and who had adopted his own peculiar form of doctrine. To those persons who could not find in his simple preaching the wisdom which they sought after, and preferred Apollos as a teacher more according to their Grecian taste,* he said that it was wrong on their part to regret the

* We have already spoken of the reference of this whole section, 1 Cor. i. 1-18. We

absence of such wisdom in his preaching, for the fountain of all genuine wisdom, the wisdom of God, was not to be found in any scheme of philosophy, but only in the doctrine of the crucified Jesus, the Saviour of the world, which he had made the central point of his preaching; but this divine wisdom could only be found and understood by a disposition that was susceptible of what was divine. He had never yet been able to lead them by his discourses to perceive in the simple doctrine of the gospel (which in the eyes of the world was foolishness) the depths of divine wisdom, because an ungodly disposition predominated in their minds, of which these party strifes were an evident sign. He gave the Corinthians a rule by which they might pass a judgment on all teachers of Christianity. Jesus the Messiah was the immovable foundation; in him lay everything which pertains to such a foundation. He was the Redeemer, and the Lord to whom all must yield themselves to have their whole lives moulded by him. And here we must bear in mind how Jesus Christ was always presented to the religious consciousness of the apostle as the One crucified, risen, ascended to heaven, and invested with divine sovereignty. Nor does Paul think of the doctrine of Christ apart from his person, but regards it as that by which we come into living communion with him, by which Christ himself enters into our hearts. This was the immovable foundation on which all Christians, collectively, or singly, must rest. The building on this or on another foundation constituted the difference, in Paul's judgment, between the true and the false teachers of Christianity. Whoever proceeded from this foundation would himself attain to salvation, and would lead others to it.

But in the structure of doctrine which was raised on this foundation, the divine might more or less be mixed with the human, and so far be deteriorated. The complete purifying process, the separation of the divine and the human, would be left to the last judgment. Many a one who had attached too great value to the human, would see the work destroyed which he had constructed, though the foundation on which it rested would remain for himself and others: such a one would be saved after many severe trials, which he must undergo for purification from the alloy of self; 1 Cor. iii. 11–15.* But from the teachers who adhered

need not enter more at large into the dispute respecting the meaning proposed by Eichorn and others, that Paul here directed his argumentation against Grecian Sophists, who had made an entrance into the church, and threatened to seduce many into unbelief.

* Since the whole passage which speaks of fire, of the building constructed of various materials, some fire-proof and others destructible by fire, and of being saved as from the midst of the fire, is composed of images, and is figurative throughout,—it is very illogical, as Origen has justly remarked, arbitrarily to detach from the rest, and take in a literal sense a single trait in the picture, as that of fire. Nor let any one say that the idea of such a judgment in the historical development is un-Pauline. The idea of such a judgment connected with the publication of the gospel, and accompanying its operations, pervades the whole New Testament,—by which indeed, a final judgment of the world, to which this is only preparative, is not excluded.

to the unchangeable foundation of God's kingdom, and built upon it, either with better or worse materials, Paul distinguishes those of whom he says, that they destroy the Temple of God itself in believers, and are guilty of peculiar sacrilege; against such he denounced the most awful punishment, "If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy;" 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17.

It is worthy of notice, that where Paul treats of eating meat offered to idols, he does not, in order to impress the Gentile Christians with their obligations to abstain from all such food, appeal to the decision of the apostolic convention at Jerusalem, any more than he opposed the authority of that decision to the Jewish Christians, who wished to compel the Gentiles to be circumcised. This is no argument against the existence of such a decision, since Paul's failure to refer to it may be explained from his peculiar method; he attached little value to such decisions, he was no friend to literal and positive command, and so did not found his arguments upon them, but rather on the inward law in the hearts of believers, on what the spirit of the gospel requires. As in the instance of those who wished to impose the law of circumcision on Gentile Christians, instead of appealing to an outward authority, he pointed out the internal contrariety of their conduct to the peculiar and fundamental principles of the gospel; so on this point, he opposed to the abuse of Christian freedom the law of love which was inseparable from the gospel. Besides, it appears that, though the authority of that decision was held sacred in Palestine, Acts xxi. 25, yet beyond these limits it seems to have been little regarded. Since that decision rested on mutual concessions, it followed that if one of the parties of the Jewish Christians failed to fulfil the condition, if they would not acknowledge the uncircumcised as their heathen brethren, then, on the other side, the obligation ceased to bind the Gentile Christians, who, by the observance of that decision, would have made an approach to the Jewish Christians. At a later period, after the settlement of the opposition between these two hostile tendencies could no longer be accomplished, but a Jewish element had gained entrance into the church itself in an altered form, this decision would, perhaps, again acquire the strict power of law.

Paul did not dispute the position which the free-thinking Christians of Corinth were always contending for, that no laws could be laid down about outward things that were in themselves indifferent; he did not even exact their deference to the apostolic decision, by which such food was absolutely forbidden; but he shows them from the spirit of the gospel, that what is in itself lawful, may, under special circumstances, cease to be so, so far as it contravenes the law of love, the obligation of Christians to act on all occasions so that the salvation of others may be most promoted, and the glory of God be subserved. He points out that they even denied their own Christian freedom, since in another way they brought themselves into subjection to outward things, which they ought

to have used with freedom in the spirit of love, according as circumstances might vary.*

In reference to the question proposed to him respecting a single life, he took a middle course between the two contending parties, those who entirely condemned a single life, and those who wished to prescribe it for all persons as something essential to Christian perfection. But in order rightly to understand what he says on this subject, in connexion with this period of the development of God's kingdom and with Paul's peculiar point of view, and to form a correct judgment according to the laws of Christian ethics, we must attend to the following considerations. For the time being, the chief object of desire was to spread the gospel as quickly and as widely as possible, and the appropriation by Christianity of all human relations was, on the contrary, but little thought of. The soul of Paul was animated to an extraordinary degree with the one glowing desire to carry to all men quickly the message of salvation. His single life, which allowed him to extend his ministry in all directions without delay and to gain his own livelihood without hindrance, was an important means for the execution of his plans. It made him, in fact, a "eunuch for the kingdom of heaven's sake," *εὐνουχισμὸς διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν*, according to the meaning of the Lord. As he was withheld by nothing in the publication of the gospel, but lived wholly for the cause of the Lord, it appeared to him the happiest condition; and looking at it from the stand-point of his own peculiar endowments and vocation, he wished that all men could share this glorious and happy life dedicated to the Lord. In addition to this, he had not yet found realised his idea of Christian wedlock in which man and wife are both dedicated to the Lord alone, and are joined together in a life animated and sanctified by the Spirit of the Lord. From this proceeded what he says of the obstacles presented by the married state for fulfilling the duties of the Christian life. He has evidently in his eye not a union, such as would correspond to the idea represented by himself in this epistle and in the Epistle to the Ephesians, in which both parties were as one in fellowship with the Lord and viewed and treated everything in the light of this fellowship; but a state of the soul divided between a regard to the Lord on the one hand, and to the world and the wedded associate on the other. And thus what he says of the injurious effects of marriage is derived from its want of correspondence to the Christian idea of marriage. And he might so much the less think of the extension of the kingdom of God by the natural propagation of the human race, since he expected the second advent and the end of the world as events near at hand,—a view of things necessarily arising from the first stage of the

* 1 Cor. vi. 12. "All things are lawful for me; but I will not be brought under the power of any," *πάντα μοι ἐξεστίν· ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγὼ ἐξουσιασθήσομαι ὑπό τινος*. If everything is lawful for me, yet I must not allow myself to be governed by external things, as if, because I *can* use them, I *must* necessarily use them.

development of God's kingdom. But if he was disposed on this side to recommend a single life, it only makes his pastoral wisdom and consideration more remarkable in deeming it needful to limit this recommendation, and in warning against the injurious effects of a forced celibacy not supported by peculiar endowments, amidst the threatening contagion of moral corruption in such a church as the Corinthian. He placed the essence of Christian perfection not in celibacy, nor in the outward denial of earthly things; but in that renunciation of the world which has its seat in the disposition, which would make the married and the rich, as well as the unmarried and the poor, ready to sacrifice everything which the exigencies of the times might demand; to suffer the loss of all things, however dear to their hearts, for the sake of the gospel; 1 Cor. vii. 29, 30.

In speaking of the various relations of life in which men might be placed at the time of their conversion, Paul lays down as a rule, that that event should produce no change in this respect. Christianity did not violently dissolve the relations in which a man found himself placed by birth, education, and the leading of divine Providence, but taught him to act in them from a new point of view, and with a new disposition. It effected no abrupt revolutions, but gradually, by the power of the Spirit working from within, made all things new. The Apostle applies this especially to the case of slaves, which it was more needful to consider, because from the beginning that gospel which was preached to the poor found much acceptance among this class, and the knowledge imparted to them by Christianity of the common dignity and rights of all men, might easily have excited them to throw off their earthly yoke. Here also, Christianity, in order not to mingle worldly and spiritual things together, and not to miss its main object, the salvation of the soul, did not presume to effect by force a sudden revolution in their condition; it operated only on the mind and disposition, a process by which civil relations were designed to be, and must necessarily be at a later day, reformed. To slaves the gospel presented a higher life, which exalted them above the restraints of their earthly relation; and though masters were not required by the apostles to give their slaves freedom, since it was foreign to their ministry to interfere with the arrangement of civil relations, yet Christianity imparted to masters such a knowledge of their duties to their slaves, and such dispositions towards them, and taught them to recognise as brethren the Christians among their slaves, in such a manner as to make their relation to them quite a different thing.

Paul, therefore, when he touches on this relation, tells the slave, that though by the arrangement of Providence he was debarred from the enjoyment of outward freedom, he should not be troubled, but rejoice that the Lord had bestowed upon him true inward freedom. But while he considers the latter as the only true freedom, in the possession of which man may be free under all outward restraints, and apart from

which no true freedom can exist, he is very far from overlooking the subordinate worth of civil freedom, for he says to the slave, to whom he had announced the true, the spiritual freedom, "but if thou mayst be free, use it rather," 1 Cor. vii. 21;* which implies that the apostle viewed the state of freedom as more corresponding to the Christian calling, and that Christianity, when it so far gained the ascendancy as to form anew the social relations of mankind, would bring about this change of state, which he declares to be an object of preference.†

* The later ascetic spirit forms a striking contrast on this point to the spirit of primitive Christianity. Although, in a grammatical view, it is most natural to supply the *ἐλεύθερος γενέσθαι* which immediately precedes, or "freedom," *ἐλευθερία*, borrowed from it, yet the later Fathers have not thus understood it, because the worth of civil freedom appeared to them not so great, but they took the apostle's meaning to be exactly opposite: "use rather slavery," *μᾶλλον χρῆσαι τῇ δουλείᾳ*. What De Wette has lately urged against our interpretation, does not appear to me convincing. The "if also," *εἰ καὶ* (he thinks) is against it; but it suits very well. The apostle says, "If called, being a slave, to Christianity, thou shouldst be content. Christian freedom will not be injured by slavery—but yet, if thou canst be free (as a still additional good, which if thou dost not attain, be satisfied without it; but which, if offered to thee, is not to be despised) therefore make use of this opportunity of becoming free, rather than by neglecting it to remain a slave. Moreover, "to use slavery," *χρῆσθαι τῇ δουλείᾳ*, would be a very singular mode of expression, since the apostle might have said much more simply, "Remain a slave." But the expression *μᾶλλον χρῆσαι* might be very well used when speaking of an opportunity of obtaining freedom; and if Paul wished to say that in case any one could obtain his freedom he should yet remain a slave, he would have suggested a more appropriate reason, for in what he does say we find absolutely nothing that can serve as an argument for it. The fact that the slave as a Christian shares true freedom with his fellow-Christians, and that he who is free partakes in this bond-service of Christ with the slave who is a Christian, contains no reason why a slave, when his freedom is offered him, should not accept it. Nor can this be inferred from v. 20, for in that nothing more is said than that no one should arbitrarily withdraw from the relations of life in which he finds himself; but it does not follow from this that when an opportunity is presented by God of entering into more favorable earthly relations, a man is not to embrace it. Such an exhortation, without any further confirmation of it, would be only an arbitrary dictation on Paul's part. But if he said, "Whoever can be free, let him avail himself of the opportunity," there was no occasion to support it by any further reason. He only guarded himself against a misapprehension which might have arisen from too broad an application of the principle he had laid down.

The connexion with v. 22 is not against it, if we recollect, that the clause beginning with *ἀλλὰ* is only a secondary or qualifying assertion, which certainly does not belong to the leading thought, a mode of construction similar to what we find elsewhere in Paul's writings.

† To this also the words in v. 23 may relate. "Ye are bought with a price (ye are made free from the dominion of Satan and sin), become not the slaves of men." Thus it would be understood by many. Christians ought not voluntarily, merely to escape from some earthly trouble, to put themselves in a condition which is not suited to their Christian calling. But since the apostle previously, when speaking of such relations as could only concern individuals in the church, used the singular, but now changed his style to the plural, it is hence probable, that he is speaking of a relation of a general kind, that is, giving an exhortation which would apply to all the Corinthians,—an exhortation indeed, which is not so closely connected with what is said in v. 22, but which he might easily have been led to make from the idea of a *δούλος Χριστοῦ*, so familiar and interesting to his mind, an idea that would equally apply to both bond and free; "Refuse not this true freedom which belongs to you as the bondsmen of Christ;"

The Corinthian church had probably requested that Apollos* might visit them again, and Paul acknowledged him as a faithful teacher, who had built on the foundation of the faith which he had laid, who had watered the field that he had planted. He was far from opposing this request; he even requested Apollos to comply with it, but Apollos was resolved not to visit Corinth immediately. The importance attached to his person, and the efforts that had been made to place him at the head of a party, perhaps led him to this determination.

Paul wrote our First Epistle to the Corinthians about the time of the Jewish Passover, as appears from the allusion in v. 7.† He had then the intention of staying at Ephesus till Pentecost; he informed them that many opportunities offered for publishing the gospel, but that he had also many enemies to contend with. He spoke of his being in daily peril of losing his life; 1 Cor. xv. 30.‡

At the time of his writing this Epistle to Corinth, he had formed an extensive plan for his future labors. As during his stay of several years in Achaia and at Ephesus, he had laid a sufficient foundation for the extension of the Christian church among the nations who used the Greek language, he now wished to transfer his ministry to the West; and as it was his fundamental principle to make those regions the scene of his activity where no one had labored before him, he wished to visit

—an exhortation which was adapted in many respects to the condition of the Corinthian church; and this warning against a servitude totally incompatible with being a servant (or bondsman) of Christ, (which could not be asserted of a state of outward servitude, or slavery, simply as such,) this warning would be a very suitable conclusion to the whole train of thought on inward and outward freedom. It was needless for him to notice the case of a person selling himself for a slave, since it was one that could hardly occur among Christians. Verse 24 is rather for, than against, this interpretation; for since v. 23 does not refer to outward relations, he once more repeats the injunction respecting them.

* See 1 Cor. xvi. 12.

† See p. 159.

‡ Schrader infers from the words in 1 Cor. xvi. 8, that Paul could not have written this epistle at the close of his long residence at Ephesus, but at the beginning of another shorter stay there; for otherwise he must have said, "I will tarry at Ephesus still," *ἐπιμενῶ δὲ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἔτι*, and could not have hoped to effect that in a few weeks for the spread of the gospel, and the vanquishing of false teachers, which he could not accomplish even after several years. But we do not see why Paul, merely having the future in his eye, and not reflecting on the past, might not have left out the "still," or "yet longer," *ἔτι*, as similar omissions frequently occur in epistolary writing; and even if Paul in the course of a long time had already effected much for the spread of the gospel, still he could say, since the sphere of his labors in Lesser Asia was continually extending, that "a great and effectual door" was opened for publishing the gospel. But the "adversaries," *ἀντικείμενοι*, in this passage, which relates to the publication of the gospel, are certainly not false teachers, but open adversaries of Christianity. As the opportunities for making known the gospel were manifold, so also its enemies were many. This, therefore, does not contradict the preceding longer residence of the apostle, but rather confirms it; for the most violent attacks on the preachers of the gospel, if they did not proceed from the Jews, would first arise, when, after long-continued labors, effects had been produced which threatened to injure the interests of many whose gains were derived from idolatrous practices.

Rome, the metropolis of the world, where a church had long since been established, on his way to Spain,* and then to commence the publication of the gospel at the extremity of Western Europe. But before putting this plan into execution, he wished to obtain a munificent collection in the churches of the Gentile Christians for their poor believing brethren at Jerusalem, and to carry the amount himself to Jerusalem accompanied by some members of the churches. Already some time before he despatched this Epistle to the Corinthians, he had sent Timothy and some others to Macedonia and Achaia to forward this collection, and to counteract the disturbing influences in the Corinthian church.† He hoped to receive through him an account of the impression which his epistle had made. But it is strange that in the Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians we can find no intimation that Timothy had visited them in the interval,—nothing that relates to the manner in which he was received by the church. This may be explained in two ways; each has its difficulties, and we do not believe that complete certainty can be arrived at.

It might have happened that Timothy had been prevented from coming to Corinth,‡ and so Paul was induced, as Timothy had returned to him

* Rom. xv. 24, 28. Dr. Baur, in his *Essay on the Object and Occasion of the Epistle to the Romans*, in the *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*, 1836, part iii. p. 154, has attempted to show that Paul could not have written these words. He thinks that he discovers in them the marks of another hand, of which in fact no trace whatever can be found,—all appears wholly Pauline. It might indeed seem strange, that the Apostle of the Gentiles had not yet visited the metropolis of the Gentile world. Accordingly, he gives an account of the causes which had hitherto prevented him, and expresses his earnest desire to become personally acquainted with the church there. Since it was most important, first of all, to lay a foundation everywhere for the publication of the gospel, on which the superstructure might afterwards be easily raised, so it was his maxim—the same which he expresses in 2 Cor. x. 16, and which we see him always acting upon—to labor only in those regions where no one before had published the gospel. But among the Gentiles at Rome a church had been long founded, and hence he could not be justified on his own principles in leaving a field of labor in which there was still so much to be done, to visit a church that had been long established, and was in a state of progressive development. The difficulties which Baur finds in this passage are only created by a false interpretation.

† 1 Cor. iv. 17. The manner in which Paul mentions Timothy both here and in xvi. 10, plainly shows that he was not the bearer of this epistle, and the latter passage makes it not improbable that Paul expected he would arrive at Corinth after his epistle, which would naturally happen though Timothy departed first, because he was detained a considerable time in Macedonia. Perhaps the messengers from the Corinthian church were already come to Ephesus when Timothy was going away, and as Paul wished to give them a copious reply, on that account he sent no epistle by Timothy.

‡ It favors this, that in Acts xix. 22, only Macedonia is mentioned as the object of his mission, and that Paul himself, 2 Cor. xii. 18, does not mention him with the others who were sent by him to Corinth. Still these circumstances prove nothing; for as to the first, the account in the Acts is not complete; and the second may be explained by supposing that Paul wrote all that he wished to say concerning Timothy in the lost epistle committed to Titus (which must, according to this view, be presupposed), and that he did not consider it necessary to make any further allusion to Timothy in our Second Epistle. Besides, he is speaking here of the second sending of Titus and only of what had quite recently taken place.

without any news from the Corinthian church, before his departure from Ephesus, to send Titus to Corinth that he might operate on the minds of the converts there in a manner suitable to the impression made by his epistle, and bring back news of the state of things among them. We must then suppose that he sent no fresh letter by this new messenger, or at least only sent with him a few lines as his credentials, since, having written so full a letter before, he thought it unnecessary to write again on the present occasion. In this way it can be explained that we find in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians no hint of an intervening epistle after our first.

But the second explanation is this,* that Timothy actually went to Corinth, but communicated to the apostle very sad and distressing accounts respecting the disposition of a part of the church. In consequence, Paul was induced to send Titus to Corinth with a second epistle referring to the occurrences in the Corinthian church, of which he had been informed by Timothy, and since enough had been spoken of this intervening visit and of Timothy's reception in this lost epistle, no more was said on these points in our second epistle, which was strictly speaking the third, and in all the fourth. In the decision of this question all turns upon this point, whether the letter so often mentioned in our second epistle according to the indications in the passages referred to, can be what we call the First Epistle to the Corinthians, or whether we are obliged to suppose another which would be that sent by Titus.

Paul says at the beginning of the second chapter that he had altered his former plan of travelling immediately from Ephesus to Corinth (2 Cor. i. 16) and had resolved to go first to Macedonia,† in order that he might not be obliged to give them pain by coming to them while the evils which he censured in his first epistle were still in existence. On this account he wished, instead of coming immediately from Ephesus to Corinth, rather to communicate by letter what was painful to them (which may very well refer to the reprehensions contained in the first epistle) and to await its operation in producing repentance, before he came to them in person. He says of the epistle in question, that he had written it in great anguish of heart, and with many tears, for his object had been not to give them pain, but to evince his love for them. Does not this suit such passages as 1 Cor. iv. 8-19; vi. 7; x. 1? Does not that which he here says of his feelings correctly describe that state of mind in which the news respecting the dangerous condition of the Corinthian church must have placed him? Do not, in fact, several severe passages occur in this epistle which might have awakened in the heart of Paul, so full of fatherly love towards the church, the apprehension that he had

* Adopted by Bleek in his valuable essay already mentioned, in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1830, part iii. But his arguments have not yet met with the favor, to which their weight, it seems to me, entitles them.

† Which change of plan he had certainly already announced to them in the First Epistle, xvi. 5.

uttered something which had wounded them too deeply? Is it not a striking agreement when in this epistle so much is said of an individual on whom Paul had passed so severe a judgment, and exactly in our first epistle such a case occurs affecting such an individual.* Must not this, therefore, serve as proof that this first epistle is the one to which reference is made in the second? This epistle was also well suited to call forth in the Corinthians that sense of their criminality, and that sorrow that leads to salvation, as Paul says of that epistle in 2 Cor. vii. 9.

Still we must not trust too much to this appearance. Although the case here mentioned seems to be the same with that which we find in the first epistle, yet on a closer examination, some important particulars meet our notice which indicate a difference. Paul guards himself, ii. 5, against the supposition that he felt personally injured. "But if any hath caused grief," he says, "he hath not grieved me, but in part, that I may not overcharge you all." He therefore represents what had taken place as not affecting himself personally, but rather as an injury done to the whole church. But in reference to the offender, of whom we are informed in the first epistle, there was no reason whatever that he should so guard himself. In that whole affair there was absolutely nothing personal. If he took it so to heart, it would only reflect credit on him from every quarter. It manifested his fatherly care for the salvation of that individual, and for the welfare of the whole church. When, moreover, he speaks of a pardon to be granted by himself and the church, this certainly suits far better a wrong done personally to the apostle in the exercise of his official power, than a sin for which the divine forgiveness was to be chiefly sought, and not a forgiveness dependent on the will of a man.† Paul, in speaking (vii. 8) of the wholesome effects of the epistle in question, reckons among them (v. 11) that an opportunity was given to the church of proving their complete freedom from blame in the affair. But in the case of that offending person, no blame could attach to the church, excepting their having omitted to show their abhorrence of such conduct by excluding him from church-communion. On the other hand, what is said would find its immediate application if the main point was contumacious behavior of an individual against the apostle of a kind in which others might have appeared to take a share. Further, Paul says in v. 12, that he had written in this tone to them, "not for his sake who did the wrong, nor for his cause that had suffered wrong, but that they might have the opportunity of showing to one another their sincere at-

* We cannot attach so much weight, as does Baur, to the fact that both in 2 Cor. ii. 6, and 1 Cor. v. 5, the individual mentioned is designated as "such an one," ὁ τοιοῦτος; for Paul might, agreeably to the connexion, have used the expression in both passages, even though it referred to different persons.

† We know indeed that it can be explained by referring everything to a readmission to church fellowship; but the striking part of the expression will not in that way be rendered prominent, and the other explanation is far more simple and natural.

tachment for him.”* That expression, “to do wrong,” *ἀδικεῖν*, was in itself not suited to mark a sin as such. And if he was speaking of a vicious person as such, the principal thing as far as regarded that person would be to lead him to repentance. He needed not to avoid the appearance of being too zealous in such a matter. No one, as we have said, could blame him for that. But everything agrees very well with the supposition that the case was one in which Paul was personally injured. Under such circumstances there was occasion for guarding himself against the reproach that he had been carried away by personal feelings. And thus he could affirm that he had been moved to write, not from a desire to retaliate on the person who had done him wrong, nor from concern for his own honor—the honor of him on whom the wrong had been committed—but he wished to give them an opportunity to clear themselves of all share in this matter, and to evince their zeal for his person and his apostolic authority.

It remains to be noticed that the affair of this immoral person occupies only a very small part of our First Epistle, and many other subjects are treated of far more fully. By what is said in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians of the letter in question, we are led to suppose that it related wholly or principally to that one affair.

If we compare all these marks with one another, we shall certainly be disposed to favor the second of the above-named suppositions. We shall be led to believe that Timothy brought many painful and distressing accounts to the apostle, especially respecting the commotion excited by an individual who had acted contumaciously against Paul, and called in question his apostolic authority. On this account Paul sent Titus with a letter to Corinth, in which he expressed himself very strongly respecting the affair; so much so, that after Titus had set out, his fatherly heart was seized with anxiety lest he had written too harshly, and been guilty of injustice to the church.

But after the sending of Titus, a violent popular tumult arose at Ephesus against the apostle,† which was nevertheless an evidence of the great

* Internal grounds do not render it necessary to depart from this objective and generally accredited reading. Certainly the zeal of the church for Paul's authority would first of all be expressed among themselves in their behavior towards one another. This it was which Titus must first observe among them as the effect of Paul's epistle. But that Paul had cause to recognise this zeal as not assumed, but as genuine and sincere, may be inferred from the phrase “before God.” Thus this reading gives a very suitable sense. Also what follows in verse 14 agrees very well with it, where Paul says that he was not ashamed of what he had boasted to Titus respecting the Corinthian church, but that his boasting was found a truth. Paul had previously told Titus, who was perhaps afraid of the hostile tone of the excited church, that he knew they would by no means make common cause with that person who had risen up so warmly against Paul's apostolic authority; and so it proved. They vied with one another in zeal for the maintenance of his authority.

† As to the assertion of Dr. Baur that all the details given in the Acts of Paul's conflicts with Jewish exorcism and heathen magic, and of the popular tumult occasioned by

success of his ministry in Lesser Asia. Small models in gold and silver of the famed temple of Artemis were numerous made,* and being sent to distant parts as objects of devotion, brought great gain to the city. A man named Demetrius, who had a large manufactory of such models, and a great number of workmen, began to fear, since the gospel had spread with such success in Lesser Asia, and faith in Artemis had so far declined† as to lessen the sale of his wares in this region, that the gains of his trade would soon be lost. He assembled his numerous workmen, and easily inflamed their anger against the enemies of their gods, who threatened to deprive the great Artemis of her honor, and them of their gain. A great tumult arose, they all hastened to the public place where they were wont to assemble, and many cried out, some one thing, some another, without knowing why they were come together. As the Jews here lived in the midst of a numerous Greek population who viewed them with constant aversion, any special occasion easily roused their slumbering prejudices into open violence, and they had then much to suffer; they feared therefore, that the anger of the people against the enemies of their gods—especially as many did not exactly know who these enemies were

the decline of the worship of Artemis, have no historical worth, but are only fabrications intended to please the imagination (Baur declares that the design of the author of the Acts was to present as brilliant a picture as possible of Paul's ministry at Ephesus, Ed.), or to magnify Paul in comparison with Peter—such an assertion we regard as completely baseless. Whoever indeed cannot for one moment transport himself out of the narrow circle of that limited view of the world which belongs to the nineteenth century, must see everywhere, in the wonderful age of which we are speaking, myths or fictions written for a special end. But when Baur, in reference to Acts xix. 20, says, "What would such a Christianity be, but an exchange of one form of superstition for another? And yet, the author of the Acts can pass such a judgment as this (xix. 20) upon it. Such a view is too unworthy of the position of an apostle, and too much conformed to a later period, to allow of our having any doubt about its origin:"—we reply, Certainly if nothing more had taken place for the spread of Christianity than the extraordinary event recorded in that passage of the Acts, this would have availed nothing. But those facts could not have taken place if the Gospel had not previously been revealed as the victorious power of God in the hearts of men. Paul, who met the Jews that "required a sign," with "the demonstration of the Spirit and of power," nevertheless made his appeal that he had been accredited as an Apostle by *σημεῖα, τέρατα* and *δυνάμεις*, 2 Cor. xii. 12. According to the views of the apostles the two were to be combined; the *internal* evidence of the power of God by the spiritual operation of the published word, and the accompanying *external* signs presenting themselves as visible marks of the former. But it belongs to the method of these most ancient Christian Records, that the internal operations are only briefly indicated or presupposed instead of being described at length, while on the contrary whatever could be an object of outward observation is given more in detail.

* The words of Paul, Acts xx. 19, perhaps intimate that this popular disturbance proceeded from the machinations of the Jews, though it afterwards threatened to be dangerous to the Jews themselves.

† It is possible, that the successful ministry of Paul already threatened the destruction of idolatry, though after the first successful propagation of the gospel, a pause in its progress intervened, as has often occurred. Compare Pliny's account of the decline of heathenism, in my Church History, vol. i. p. 140.

—would be turned upon themselves; and one of their number, Alexander by name, came forward, in order to shift the blame from themselves upon the Christians; but the appearance of such a person whom they ranked among these enemies, aroused the heathen to still greater fury, and the clamour became more violent. But on this occasion the populace only appear to have been hostile to the teachers of Christianity; the manner in which Paul had lived and acted during his long residence in the city must have operated advantageously on the public authorities of the city. Some even of the magistrates who had the charge this year of regulating all the *sacra* in Lesser Asia,* and who presided over the public games, showed their sympathy for him, for when he was on the point of exposing himself to the excited crowd, they besought him not to incur this danger. And the chamberlain of the city at last succeeded in calming the minds of the people by his representations, by calling on them to give an account of the object of their meeting, of which the majority were totally ignorant, and by reminding them of the serious responsibility they incurred for their turbulent and unlawful behavior.

It is very doubtful whether Paul was determined by this disturbance, which seems to have been quite transitory, to leave Ephesus earlier than he had intended according to his original plan. When he wrote his first letter to the Corinthians, he spoke to them of the dangers which daily threatened him, and yet these had no influence in determining the length of his sojourn in this city. Perhaps we may find several allusions to this very disturbance.† A comparison of the First and Second Epistles to

* 'Ασιάρχαι: each of the cities which formed the Κοινὸν τῆς Ἀσίας chose a delegate yearly for this college of 'Ασιάρχαι. See *Aristid. Orat. Sacr.* iv. ed. *Dindorf.* vol. i. p. 531; and probably the president of this college would be called ἀρχιερεὺς, ἀσιάρχης; his name was employed in marking the date of public events; see the Letter of the Church at Smyrna, on the martyrdom of Polycarp; and Ezechiel Spanheim, *de Præstantia et Usu Numismatum*, ed. *secunda*, p. 691.

† He says, 1 Cor. xv. 31, that he was daily exposed to death, which may lead us to conclude, that before he had reached the end of this epistle, (which was probably not written all at once,) this disturbance had taken place. Thus we may take the words in v. 32, with Theodoret, in a literal sense; "according to human calculation, I had become the prey of wild beasts, but I was miraculously kept safe," κατὰ ἀνθρώπινον λογισμόν θηρίων ἐγενόμην βορὰ, ἀλλὰ παραδόξως εσώθην, that is, it was demanded by the raging populace, as afterwards was often the case in the persecutions of the Christians, that the enemy of the gods should be condemned to the beasts, to the lion, *ad bestias*, *ad leonem*. But though such a cry might certainly have been raised by the infuriated multitude, it is very difficult to suppose, considering the existing circumstances, that their desire would have been granted, and Paul therefore could not have said, that, as far as he could expect, according to human judgment, he would have been, except for the wonderful help of God, a prey to the wild beasts. Also this interpretation of the words κατὰ ἀνθρώπου, is not the easiest and most favored by the connexion. I rather find in these words, according to the connexion, the contrast to the Christian hope, the designation of the position of men in general who are destitute of this hope. By the wild beasts must therefore be understood, savage infuriated men with whom Paul had to contend. From Rom. xvi. 4, where it is said that Priscilla and Aquila had ventured their lives for him, as well as from

the Corinthians with one another, may indeed favor the belief, that Paul wrote the latter after this event, since he here writes as one who had been rescued from impending death.* But it may be supposed, that when he found himself in the midst of those dangers, the higher concerns of which he treated in the First Epistle to the Corinthians so occupied him, that he forgot everything personal; but that when he had left Ephesus, the recollections of the special dealings of Providence, which had rescued him from such dangers, filled him with overflowing gratitude which he could not suppress.

what Paul says in Acts xx. 19, we may gather that he was exposed to many dangers at Ephesus which are not mentioned in the Acts.

* According to the interpretation proposed by Rückert, these expressions do not refer to persecutions endured by Paul, but to a dangerous illness, the effects of which accompanied him to Macedonia, and were felt by him when he wrote this Second Epistle to the Corinthians. But on comparing all that relates to it, I cannot assent to this view. As to the passage in 2 Cor. i. 8, it appears to me that these words must be explained according to v. 5. I grant, indeed, that natural diseases may be called in a certain sense "sufferings of Christ," *παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ*; but, in accordance with Pauline usage, we should apply such a designation primarily to suffering for the cause of the kingdom of God, in which the believer follows Christ. Rückert thinks that if Paul had intended to signify the persecution that had been excited at Ephesus, he would have named the city itself, as in the First Epistle. But I do not see why he should not choose the general designation of the region of which Ephesus was the metropolis; and, it is possible, that the exasperation of the heathen against him spread from Ephesus to other parts of Lesser Asia which he visited. Why then might he not say, that the persecutions exceeded the measure of his human strength, that he was almost overcome and despaired of his life? In 2 Cor. iv. 9 and 11, he distinctly notices persecutions by which he was in continual danger of death, with which 1 Cor. xv. 30, 31 agrees; from these passages we may conclude that he was exposed to more dangers than are recorded in the Acts. And in this way other passages must be explained. The mention of the earthen vessels, 2 Cor. iv. 7, is not against this view, for the conflicts which Paul had to sustain always served to awaken in his mind a more vivid consciousness that he carried about the divine treasure in an earthen broken vessel, that this shattered receptacle would soon be entirely destroyed by such assaults unless strengthened and rescued by Almighty power. He might well say in v. 10, that he always bore about in his body the "dying of the Lord Jesus," *νέκρωσις τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, because he was always exposed to death for the cause of Christ (v. 11.), and bearing the marks of these sufferings in his body, he thus carried with him an image of the suffering Saviour in his own person. What he says in v. 9, and in the whole context, marks the disposition of one who had reason to consider the duration of his life as very uncertain, whether he met with a natural or violent death. 2 Cor. vi. 9 is to be explained according to iv. 9 and 11. 2 Cor. vii. 5 shows that even in Macedonia he had no respite from his sufferings, but was overwhelmed with fresh trials. Here we find no trace of illness. The word *σὰρξ* by no means justifies us in understanding the passage of illness; it denotes everything which could affect the outer man, while within the highest peace might be enjoyed. The passage in 2 Cor. xii. 7 (see p. 171) is too obscure for us to draw any conclusion from it with certainty; and even if here a chronic disorder were intended, it would not be clear that what was said before had any reference to it. We do not deny that Paul had to contend with much bodily weakness; we do not deny, see p. 171, that the tribulation he endured must have impaired his bodily strength; but it does not follow that the passages above quoted have such a reference.

After Paul had labored at Troas in preaching the gospel, and had waited in vain for Titus, whom he expected on his return from Corinth, he left that place with troubled feelings, and went to meet him in Macedonia. Among the Macedonian churches he met with gratifying proofs of the advance of the Christian life, to which their conflicts with the world had contributed. Doubtless no persecutions of Christianity as a *religio illicita* had as yet been commenced by the authorities of the state. But still the Christians, by their withdrawing from the heathen worship and all that was connected with it, must have unfavorably impressed the heathen among whom they lived, and excited the hatred of the fanatical populace, who were further instigated by the Jews. Even if no legal charge could be brought against the believers as apostates from the religion of the state, still without this instrument, zealous heathens, who formed so large a majority, possessed sufficient means to oppress or injure in their worldly prospects a class of persons so far below themselves in numbers, respectability, and political influence. It may illustrate this, if we only think of what converts to Christianity in the East Indies have had to endure (though under a Christian government) from their heathen relatives and connexions. But the Macedonian Christians cheerfully endured everything for the cause of the gospel; and however much their means of subsistence had been injured, they were ready to take an active part in the collection made by Paul in the church at Jerusalem, even "beyond their power;" 2 Cor. viii. In Macedonia the apostle had also at last the satisfaction of meeting with Titus, and of learning from him that his epistle had produced a salutary effect, if not on the whole, yet on the greater part of the Corinthian church. The disapprobation of the larger and better part had been expressed against the incestuous person, and the voice of this majority, which as such must have been decisive in the assemblies of the church, had either actually expelled him from church communion, according to the judgment expressed by Paul, or the actual execution of the sentence had been put off in the event of his not receiving forgiveness from the apostle. When the resolution of the majority was announced to the offender, with expressions of severe reprehension, he expressed the greatest sorrow and penitence. On this account the majority, who always acknowledged the apostolic authority of Paul, interceded on his behalf that a milder course might be adopted, and Paul assented, in order that the penitent might not be plunged in despair, and thus a greater calamity ensue.* The

* In the words, 2 Cor. ii. 5-10, I cannot find anything different from what I have stated in the text. Nor do they support Rückert's assertion, that the majority of the church, though they expressed their disapprobation of the offender, were not disposed to proceed against him as severely as Paul desired, and that the apostle only yielded to their wishes from prudential motives, in order to maintain his authority, and to preserve the appearance of directing their decisions. Paul says, 2 Cor. ii. 6, "Sufficient to such a man is this punishment which was inflicted of many." From this we cannot infer that it differed from the sentence passed by the apostle himself. *This, said he*—only referring to

majority showed the greatest regard for the apostle's authority; they lamented having occasioned him so much trouble, and assured him how earnestly they longed to see him soon among them. But Paul's opponents among the Judaizers were not humbled, but on the contrary, were only embittered against him by his reprimand and the submission paid to him by the rest of the church, and used every means in their power to make the church suspicious of him. They said that he was powerful only in his letters, but that "his bodily presence was weak, and his speech contemptible;" 2 Cor. x. 10. He threatened more than he could perform, and hence was very far from formidable. He was conscious of his weakness, and therefore was always threatening to come, but never came. In his first epistle, which has not come down to us, he probably threatened the contumacious that he would soon come to Corinth, and if what was amiss were not rectified, he would exert the utmost prerogative of his office. In that lost epistle, or by verbal communications, he had announced to them that as soon as he had left Ephesus, he would come immediately to them, as he wished, after a transient sojourn at Corinth, to travel into Macedonia, and return again to them, in order to remain with them till his intended departure to Jerusalem.* But since he now

what had taken place, and in connexion with what followed—is indeed not unanimous, but yet the punishment awarded to him by the voice of the majority. "It is sufficient," may mean, enough has been done that this sentence of the majority has been expressed, and that he has been brought to contrition, so that now a milder course may be adopted, and he may be received again into church-communion. Or, it is sufficient that the majority have adopted this resolution; but since he is now penitent, it need not be carried into effect. The pain which he has already suffered is enough. Hence, (v. 7), instead of continuing to act with that strictness, and carrying into effect that resolution of the church, they might announce forgiveness to him, for (v. 9) Paul had attained his object; they had, by virtue of that resolution of the majority, given him the proof he required of their obedience. He required nothing more (v. 10.) As they had assented to his severe sentence, so now he was ready with them to forgive, for he had attained the object he had at heart—the welfare of the church. Paul also expressly commends (vii. 11) the indignation they had manifested in this affair, the "revenge," *ἐκδίκησις*, they had felt, thus acquitting themselves of all participation in the wickedness. As I must here reaffirm the view I have before taken, I must also state that I find no ground for the complaint made by Rückert, with whom Baur agrees, against Paul, although I must admit the right to such a free judgment even on an apostle, and can find in it nothing unchristian. Neither can I here discern that excessive warmth of temper, which never does good, nor afterwards the returning prudence, which, at the cost of truthfulness, would as far as possible repair the damage done in the heat of passion; even if I admit as settled the disputed point that the reference here is to the same case as in 1 Cor. v. 3. I discern in this latter passage nothing but genuine apostolic zeal against sin, which could be held back by no considerations, and which even the unfavorable issue could not prove to be wrong; for what is right remains so, independently of the consequences which depend on the wills of men, and on circumstances.

* 2 Cor. i. 15. "In this confidence I wished *first*," (placed, according to the more correct reading, for the sake of emphasis, before *ἔλθεῖν*) "to come to *you*" (before I went to Macedonia) "that you might receive a second work of grace" (that is, the second through his ministrations, when he should make them a longer visit on his return from Macedonia, as is specially stated in the sixteenth verse, which is explanatory of the preceding).

remained longer in Ephesus, since he had altered the plan of his journey, and had announced to the Corinthians that he would first go into Macedonia, and then come to them; so they took advantage of this arrangement to accuse him of conscious weakness, of vacillation, and of ambiguity in his expressions. And thus uncertain and vacillating, they concluded, he must be as a teacher. Hence his self-contradictory conduct in reference to the observance of the Mosaic law by the Jews and Gentiles. They endeavored to set in a false light that Christian prudence which always distinguished Paul, and which was united in him with perfect simplicity of intention, as if he employed a variety of artifices to deceive men. Also all that was amiss, which he had denounced in his letters, had not yet been put away by that part of the church which adhered to the apostle.

Such being the state of the Corinthian church, Paul thought it best—in order that his own visit to Corinth might be disturbed by no unpleasant occurrences, and that his intercourse with the Corinthians might be one of joy and love—to write once more to them, in order to prepare the way for his personal ministry among them. He sent Titus, with two other able persons in the service of the church, as bearers of this epistle to Corinth.*

In reference to that marked suspicion of his conduct and character, Paul appeals in this epistle to the testimony of his own conscience, that in his intercourse with men in general, and especially with the Corinthians, he had been guided not by worldly prudence, but by the Spirit of God; he contrasts one with the other, since he considered simplicity and uprightness of intention as the essential mark of the agency of the Divine Spirit. His epistle also testifies to this; as he wrote, so he thought:† he had nothing in his mind different from his avowed intentions. He states the reasons of the alteration in the plan of his journey, and draws the conclusion that no inconsistency can be found in what he had said on this matter. And he could call God to witness that no inconsistency could be found in his manner of publishing the gospel; that he had always preached one unchangeable doctrine of Christ, and the promises which they received would be certainly fulfilled through Christ.‡ God himself

* One of these (2 Cor. viii. 18) was chosen from the Macedonian churches, that he might in their name convey the collection to Jerusalem, and he is distinguished as one whose "praise was in all the churches" for his activity in publishing the gospel. It may have been Luke, or some other person.

† 2 Cor. i. 12, 13. The grounds on which De Wette objects to this interpretation are not obvious to me. "But what suspicion of duplicity could the confident assertions in v. 12 awaken," he asks. This verse could indeed awaken no such suspicion, but is rather directed against that suspicion which Paul's enemies sought to excite; v. 13 serves to corroborate what he had said in v. 12. Paul makes the appeal, that in his epistle, as well as in his whole ministry, nothing could be found of a "fleshly wisdom," σοφία σαρκική, which his adversaries wished to find in those words: he maintains that all his words, not less than his actions, bore the impress of "simplicity," ἀπλότης.

‡ Therefore independently of the law of which his adversaries prescribed the observance.

had given them as well as him the certain pledge of this, by the common witness of the Holy Spirit in their hearts. (2 Cor. i. 16–22.)

The duty of vindicating his apostolic character against the accusations of his opponents forced him to speak much of himself. The palpably evident object of his doing this, and the distinction which he was always careful to make between the divine power connected with his apostolic functions, and the person of a feeble mortal between the "man in Christ," and the weak Paul,* sufficiently acquitted him of the charge of self-conceit and vain-glory. To common men, who would measure everything by the same measure, many things might seem strange in Paul's manner of speaking of himself and his ministry, so that they were ready to accuse him of extravagance—of a self-exaltation bordering on insanity. But what impelled him to speak in such strong terms was not personal feeling, but the inspired consciousness of the divine power attached to the gospel, and to his apostolic calling, which would triumph over all opposition. It was this consciousness which caused him to fear nothing, and enabled him to speak with so much confidence against his enemies. Thus the fact of his "not being able to do anything of himself" redounded in his view to the glory of God. Against his Judaizing opponents, with whom arrogance stood in the place of power, (2 Cor. xi. 21), to whom he would willingly appear weak in that which they esteemed strength, and who, incapable of understanding the divine power in earthen vessels, charged him with threatening to do more than he was able to perform, he declared, with confidence, that he would prove himself to be a genuine apostle in the fulfilment of his threatenings, and in the punishment of the bad. He only wished that he might have no opportunity of proving this, but that everything wrong in the church might be set right before he came, and thus no occasion be left for administering punishment. He would then gladly be regarded as an incapable or not genuine apostle by the non-fulfilment of his threatenings, provided only the Corinthians showed themselves to be approved Christians, for all the power granted to him was only for the truth, and not against it; 2 Cor. xiii. 6, 8.†

* To this the passage in 2 Cor. v. 13 refers. "For whether we be beside ourselves, (the inspiration with which the apostle spoke of the divine objects of his calling, of what the power of God effected through his apostolic office, but which his adversaries treated as empty boasting, and ascribed to an *ὑποσύννη* or *μανία*) it is to the glory of God; or whether we be sober (by which the apostle spoke of himself as a weak mortal, put himself on a level with the Corinthians, and made no use of his apostolic power and his privileges) it is for your welfare."

† Baur, proceeding on the assumption that the same affair is referred to in 2 Cor. ii. as in 1 Cor. v., and that Paul in his first epistle threatened more than he had power to accomplish, concludes thus (p. 329,) "This passage contains a not unimportant criterion for judging of the alleged miracles of the apostles. The apostles had certainly the consciousness of miraculous power in themselves, and in this consciousness they could regard very distinguished effects of their agency—operations of a powerful energy—as "signs, wonders, and powers," *σημεῖα, τέρατα* and *δυνάμεις*. But as at that time in a definite case,

Paul spent the rest of the summer and autumn in Macedonia. He probably extended his labors to the neighboring country of Illyria,* and then removed to Achaia, where he spent the winter.

Since he was now resolved, after his return from the journey to Jerusalem, which he proposed undertaking at the beginning of the spring, to change the scene of his labors to the west, and to visit the metropolis of the Roman empire for the first time, he must have been gratified to form a connexion previously with the church in that city. The journey of Phœbe, the deaconess of the church at Cenchræa, who had been induced by certain business affairs to repair to Rome, gave him the best opportunity for this purpose, while, at the same time, he recommended her to the care of the Roman church.†

In which this (consciousness) was so distinctly expressed, a miracle, strictly so called, was far enough from taking place, just as little did this happen at any other time." We perceive that Dr. Baur consistently with the principles of his philosophy must thus judge respecting everything distinguished as a miracle, since these principles exclude *a priori* the recognition of anything supernatural whatever. But we cannot consider the premises here advanced, and the conclusion drawn from them, as correct. For even if we grant the disputed point, the identity of the two cases, still it will not be evident that Paul ascribed to himself a power which he could not exercise, for he expressly represents as his object, 1 Cor. v. 5, to awaken to repentance the person whom the judgment was intended to affect, that through bodily suffering he might obtain spiritual health. Now if that offender had already given signs of repentance, the fulfilment of such a judgment must of course fail, as Paul in the passage quoted tells us that he would gladly, for the good of the church, appear as one who threatened in vain. Lastly, there appears no good reason for placing the extraordinary operation in question under the same category as other miracles. Christ himself did not perform miracles of judgment, and in no passage has he given such power to the apostles, as is the case with the other miracles, to the accomplishment of which Paul refers in his epistles as indisputable. And his language here is more credible in proportion as such outward miracles appeared little in his eyes in comparison with the one internal miracle, 1 Cor. i. 22, 23; ii. 4.

* In 2 Cor. x. 14–16, Paul seems to mark Achaia as the extreme limit of his labors in preaching the gospel; (this indeed does not follow from the *ἄχρι καὶ ἑμῶν*, since *ἄχρι* in itself does not denote a fixed or exclusive limit, see Rom. v. 13, though Paul sometimes uses the word in this latter sense also, Gal. iii. 19: iv. 2; and this certainly seems to be the meaning here from the comparison of the three verses in connexion;) on the other hand, in Rom. xv. 19, Illyria is thus marked. But it does not certainly follow from this last passage that Paul himself had preached the gospel in Illyria; possibly he only mentioned this as the extreme limit which had been reached through his instrumentality.

† It is here, of course, taken for granted, that the 16th chapter belongs with the whole of the Epistle to the Romans, which in modern times has been again disputed by Schulz in the *Studien und Kritiken*, vol. ii. p. 609; but, as it appears to me, on insufficient grounds. It may excite surprise that Paul should salute so many individuals in a church to which he was personally a stranger, and that we find among them relations and old friends of the apostle from Palestine, and other parts of the East. But we must recollect, that Rome was always the rendezvous of persons from all parts of the Roman empire, a fact which Athenæus has stated so strongly, *Deipnosoph.* i. 36, *τὴν Ῥωμαίων πόλιν ἐπιτομὴν τῆς οἰκουμένης, ἐν ᾗ συνιδεῖν ἐστὶν πάσας τὰς πόλεις ἰδρυμένας*, (an epitome of the habitable world is the city of the Romans, in which, at once, may be seen all the cities established,)—such as Alexandria, Antioch, Nicomedia, and Athens—*καὶ γὰρ ὅλα τὰ ἔθνη ὑθρόως εὐτόθι συνῶκισται*, (for truly all nations dwell there crowded together). Paul might easily

It is not improbable (see pp. 193, 250,) that, at an early period, the seed of the gospel had been brought by Jewish Christians to the Jews at Rome, as at that time, if we may judge from the salutations at the end of the epistle, persons who were among the oldest Christians lived

have become personally acquainted at Ephesus and Corinth with many Christians from Rome, or learned particulars respecting them. Among those whom he salutes were persons of the family of Narcissus, who was, as is known, a freed-man of the Emperor Claudius, and who under that emperor was highly esteemed at Rome. That Aquila and Priscilla were again in Rome, that a part of the church assembled in their house, and that a number of years afterwards, as may be inferred from the 2d Epistle to Timothy, they are to be found at Ephesus,—all this, from what we have before remarked, is not so surprising. The warning against the Judaizing teachers, xvi. 17, who published another doctrine than what they had received (from the disciples of the apostle), agrees perfectly with what is said in the 14th chapter, and this harmonises well with what we may infer from the epistle itself, in reference to the state of the Roman church. The passage in xvi. 19 agrees also with i. 8, and the comparison confirms the belief that they both belong to the same epistle. Baur, in his Essay before quoted, (see the *Tübinger Zeitschrift* for 1836, 3d No., p. 144 ff.) has endeavored to prove the spuriousness of the last two chapters. He believes that, in the 15th chapter especially, he can trace a later writer attached to Pauline principles, who thought that, in order to justify Paul, and to bring about a union between the Jewish and Gentile Christians, it was necessary to make some additions to the epistle; but I cannot perceive the validity of the evidence adduced by this acute critic. Paul was probably prevented when he had finished the 14th chapter, from continuing the epistle to the close. And when he took it up again where he left off, and looked back on what he had last written; he felt himself impelled to add something on the theme of which he had last treated, the harmony between the Gentile and Jewish Christians in the Roman church, a passage similar to one in 2 Cor. ix. His object was, on the one hand, to check the free-thinking Gentile Christians from self-exaltation in relation to their weaker Jewish brethren in the faith; and on the other hand, to remind the Jewish Christians that the admission of the Gentiles into a participation in the kingdom of God was by no means an infringement of the rights of the Jewish people, and that it was in unison with the predictions of the Old Testament. He exhorts them, xv. 7, to receive one another mutually as members of the same kingdom of God, though with a special reference to the Gentile Christians, to whom Paul at the beginning of the chapter particularly addressed himself, if we follow the best accredited reading, "you," *ὑμεῖς*. He then states the reasons why the Gentiles had especial cause to praise God, to be thankful and humble, since God had in so unexpected a manner brought them to a participation of his kingdom, who previously knew nothing of it, and who had no hopes of this kind, (a train of thought which he introduces elsewhere, Ephes. ii. 12, and in several other passages of the same epistle). He states antithetically that God, by the sending of Christ to the Jews, manifested his faithfulness, since thus he had fulfilled the promise made to the fathers; but had manifested his mercy to the Gentiles, since he had called to a participation in the kingdom of God, those among whom the foundation of this kingdom had not been laid, and to whom no promises had been given. Such a rhetorical antithesis is of course not perfectly strict, but partial, and is of a kind frequently employed by Paul. Then he says: the Old Testament also declares, that the Messiah will extend his saving efficiency to the Gentiles. Therein lies, therefore, a limitation of what he had before said, for it is clear from this that while God shewed his mercy to the Gentiles he at the same time thereby verified his faithfulness also. In all this, we find nothing un-Pauline, nothing foreign to the object of this epistle. It is impossible that Paul could intend to close with the 14th chapter, but according to the usual style of the Pauline epistles, a conclusion must necessarily follow, which these last two chapters furnish.

at Rome; but these certainly did not form the main body of the church, for the greater part evidently consisted of Christians of Gentile descent, to whom the gospel had been published by men of the Pauline school, independently of the Mosaic law, to whom Paul, as the apostle of the Gentiles, felt himself called to write, and whom, in the consciousness of this relation to them, he could address with greater freedom. How could Paul, from his call to publish the gospel to all the nations of the world, have inferred his call to announce the doctrine of salvation to the Romans, (Rom. i. 5, 6,) if he had not believed that those to whom his epistle was especially addressed were Gentiles? For the Jews, whether living among the Romans or Greeks, always considered themselves as belonging, not to the גוֹיִם, ἔθνη, to the "Gentiles," but to the one עַם, the λαός, the "people" in the "dispersion," διασπορά. In reference to them, Paul could only have spoken of being sent to one nation.* How could he say (Rom. i. 13) that he wished to come to Rome in order "to have some fruit" there, "even as among other Gentiles," by the publication of the gospel, if he had not been writing principally to persons belonging to the Gentiles, among whom alone he had hitherto been wont to gain fruit? Verse 14 shows very clearly, also, that he was very far from thinking of the Jews. What else could have occasioned him to mention, that as elsewhere, so also in the metropolis of the civilized world, he was not ashamed to publish the gospel? For in reference to the Jews, it could make no great difference whether he met with them at Jerusalem or at Rome; the same obstacle to their believing the gospel existed in both places, the obstacle which made Jesus the Crucified an offence to them. It cannot be concluded from his specially addressing the Gentile Christians in xi. 13, that the epistle was not, as a whole, also intended for them; for in any case—since there were Jews in the church, though they formed the minority—when he expressed anything which was applicable only to the Gentile members, it was needful that he should thus distinguish it. If we suppose those Jewish Christians who taught the continued obligation of the Mosaic law to have formed the original body of the church, it will not be easy to explain how Gentile Christians who adopted the Pauline principles (and who must evidently have been a minority), could join themselves to such. But it is altogether different, if we suppose this church to have been constituted like others of the Gentile Christians of which we have before spoken. Moreover, in the

* This is contrary to Baur, p. 117; nor is it set aside by what he says in his *Paulus*, p. 378. While he asserts, that "the Jews living in Rome were regarded by him no longer as Jews, but as Romans," he adds, "so much the more if, what I am far from denying, there were Gentile Christians among them." But it must be supposed, that Paul, when he wrote the epistle, thought particularly either of the one or the other. A quite different class of references must have suggested themselves to the apostle, in writing to a church of which the most influential part were Jews, from those he would have employed in writing to one consisting mainly of Gentiles. Therefore the argument against Baur's position is not weakened by the addition he has here made to it.

Neronian persecution, the Christian church appears as a new sect hated by the people, a *genus tertium*, of whom, since they were opposed to all the forms of religion hitherto in existence, the people were disposed to credit the worst reports. But this could not have been the case if Judaism had been the predominant element in the Roman church. The Christians would then have been scarcely distinguished from the Jews, and it was not unusual to pay much attention to the internal religious disputes of the Jews. In the controversy with the churches in Lesser Asia,* the bishops of Rome were opposers of the Jewish Christian Easter; this was closely connected with the formation of the Christian cultus on Pauline principles, and an appeal could here be made to an ancient tradition. To the marks of an anti-Jewish tendency belongs also the custom of fasting on the Sabbath. The opinion that this anti-Jewish tendency arose as a reaction against an earlier Judaizing tendency, is at variance with what has been said, and is also in itself unhistorical; for since at a later period we see the hierarchical element (which is decidedly Jewish, and favorable rather than otherwise to Judaism), peculiarly prominent precisely in the Roman church, so it is difficult to suppose that exactly at this time a reaction should be produced against Judaism,† arising from primitive Christian consciousness and the Pauline spirit. In the work of Hermas, we recognise indeed a conception of Christianity much more according to James than according to Paul, (and yet not throughout and entirely Judaizing,) but we know too little of the relation in which the author of this book stood to the whole Roman church, to determine anything respecting the prevailing tendency of the latter. This remark applies more strongly to the Clementines of which the origin is so uncertain, and which by their leading sentiments is essentially distinguished from the Shepherd of Hermas, although some points of affinity exist in the two works. In Rome, the capital of the world, where the most diverse kinds of religion from all countries were tolerated, the different Christian sects would soon seek a settlement, and establish themselves. We, therefore, are not justified in saying of every sect which we see arising out of the bosom of the Roman church, that it proceeded from the religious tendency that originally predominated in it. This applies particularly to the Monarchians, who yet could not all be referred to a Judaizing element; for a Praxeas, of whom we certainly know that he found a point of connexion in the whole Roman church—which by no means can be asserted of other kinds of Monarchians—stood, by his peculiar conceptions of the doctrine of Christ as the self-revealing and revealed God, in most direct opposition to the Judaizing point of view, in many respects still more than was at that time the case with the common

* See specially the letter of Irenæus in Eusebius, v. 24.

† Dr. Baur, whose views I am here opposing, in his Essay against Rothe, on the Origin of Episcopacy in the Christian church, (*Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*, 1838, part iii. p. 141), endeavors to prove that this reaction against Judaism, supposing that to have originally predominated, took place at a later period in the Roman church.

church doctrine of Subordination. But when the Artemonites appealed to their agreement with the earlier Roman bishops, we cannot accept this as historical evidence. Sects have always had an interest to claim high antiquity for their doctrines, and the Artemonites could easily make use for their purpose of many indefinite expressions of earlier doctrinal statements. They appealed *generally* to the antiquity of their doctrine in the church, and yet we know that the ancient hymns and the apologies could with justice be adduced against them as witnesses for the doctrine of the divinity of Christ. We consider, therefore, the opinion as well grounded, that the Roman church was formed principally from the stock of Gentile Christians, and that the Pauline form of doctrine originally prevailed among them.*

In this church, the state of affairs was similar to that which for the most part existed in churches where the Gentile-Christian element, though mingled with the Jewish-Christian, predominated. The Jewish Christians could not bring themselves to acknowledge the Gentiles, who neglected the ceremonial law, as altogether their equals in relation to the kingdom of God; the Gentile Christians also still retained those feelings of contempt with which they were wont to contemplate the Jews, and the manner in which the greater part of the Jews opposed the publication of the gospel, confirmed them in this temper of mind; Rom. xi. 17, 18.

Paul in this epistle lays before the church, which he had not yet taught personally, the fundamental principles of the gospel; he wished, as he himself says, Rom. xv. 15, to recall to their remembrance† what

* The testimony of Hilarius (the so-called Ambrosian), to which Baur appeals as historical evidence, we certainly dare not estimate too highly; for this writer of the second half of the fourth century could hardly have made use of historical sources on the constitution of the Roman church to which Paul wrote. He had scarcely any other sources of information than we have; his testimony appears to have been merely deduced from this epistle according to his own interpretation of it.

† It is generally supposed that the "in some sort," ἀπὸ μέρους, in this verse, relates to some particular passages of the epistle, which might seem to be written in too bold a tone. We might admit this, if any such severe censure of the faults of the church were to be met with in this epistle as appear in the first Epistle to the Corinthians. In this case, we might suppose that Paul would think proper to apologise for such harsh expressions, as proceeding from one who was not personally known to the church. But such animadversions on the church we do not find in this epistle; and in all that he says respecting the state of the Gentile world, to which they belonged before their conversion, as well as in all that he says to warn them against self-exaltation, I can find nothing which would occasion such an apology on the part of such a man as Paul. Hence, I cannot help considering the "in some sort," ἀπὸ μέρους, only as qualifying the "more boldly," τολμηρότερον, or that it relates to what follows. Paul places the boldness in this, that he, though personally unknown to the church, ventures to step forward as its teacher, to write to them such an epistle in which he appears to wish to announce the doctrine of salvation, as if it were entirely new to them. But he explains his design, that it was only to "put them in mind" of what they had already heard, and he believed himself to be justified in so doing in virtue of that call by divine grace through which he had been commissioned to preach the gospel to the Gentiles. He even qualifies the "putting them in mind" by the prefixing of ἐπι, thus representing it as something accessory, and not absolutely required. In those

had been announced to them as the doctrine of Christianity, and to testify that this was the genuine Christian truth, which alone could satisfy the religious wants of human nature, and exhorted them not to allow themselves to be led astray by any strange doctrine. This epistle may therefore specially serve to inform us, what was in Paul's estimation the essence of the gospel.

He begins with assuring them that shame could not have kept him back from publishing the gospel in the capital of the civilised world; for he had never had occasion to be ashamed of the doctrine of the gospel, since everywhere, among Gentiles as well as Jews, it had shown itself capable of working with divine power for the salvation of men, if they would only believe; by this doctrine they all obtained what all alike needed,—that which was essential to the salvation of men,—the means by which they might be brought from a state of estrangement from God in sin, to become holy before God. In order to establish this, it was necessary for the apostle to show that all, both Jews and Gentiles, were in need of this means. He must endeavor to lead them both to a consciousness of their sinfulness and guilt, and to take notice of that which might hinder either party, according to their respective points of view, from attaining this consciousness, the self-deceptions and sophisms, which could prevent their recognition of the truths which he announced. He had then to point out to the Gentiles that their consciences testified against them, that they could not excuse themselves in their sins by pleading ignorance of God and his law; he had to assure the Jews, on the other hand, that that law, in the possession of which they were so proud, could only utter a sentence of condemnation against them as its violators; he exposed their self-delusion, in thinking that by the works of the law such as they could perform, or in virtue of their descent from the theocratic nation, they could appear as holy before God.

After pointing out that both parties were equally in need of the means of salvation, the object he had in view led him to develop the manner in which man, by faith in the Redeemer, might become holy before God, and to exhibit the blessed consequences that followed from this new relation to God; and in this development, he takes pains, as is evident in various passages, so to influence the two parts of which the church at Rome consisted, the Gentile and the Jewish Christians, that uniting in an equally humble acknowledgment of the grace to which they were indebted for their salvation, neither one might exalt itself above the other; he closes the whole development with extolling that grace, to which all stood in the same relation, being equally in need of deliverance, and which all must at last unite in glorifying.*

In the practical exhortations which form the last part of this epistle,

words, in the interpretation of which I cannot agree with Baur, I can detect nothing un-Pauline. On the contrary, I find here the same Pauline mode of address as in Rom. i. 12

* See chapter xi. 33–36.

the wisdom is apparent with which Paul apprehended the relations in which the new converts to Christianity were placed, anticipated the errors into which they were likely to be seduced, and endeavored to suggest the best preservatives against their influence. The seditious spirit of the Jews, which refused to acknowledge the legitimacy of any Gentile government (see my Church History, vol. i. p. 37,) could not find ready entrance into the Church at Rome, since the majority of its members, being Gentile Christians, were not exposed to infection on this side. But similar errors, from a misunderstanding of Christian truth, might easily arise among them, as actually happened at a later period. Accustomed to consider themselves as members of the kingdom of God, in opposition to the heathen world, they were in danger of giving an outward form to this opposition, which properly belonged to the internal disposition, and thus exciting a hostile tendency against all existing civil institutions, which would be looked upon as all belonging to the kingdom of the evil spirit. With the consciousness of belonging to the kingdom of God, a misapprehension arising from carnal views might be connected, that those who were destined to rule hereafter in the kingdom of the Messiah, need not even in the present life submit to worldly authority. Such a carnal misapprehension might easily connect itself with the doctrine of Christian freedom, and the apostle on other occasions had thought it needful to caution against it; Gal. v. 13. He wished to be beforehand in opposing such practical errors, which his knowledge of human nature led him to anticipate, if he had not already witnessed similar ones; accordingly, he strictly enjoined on the Roman Christians, that as they ought to consider the institution of civil government generally as a divine ordinance, instituted for a definite object in the plan of Providence;* so they should judge of governments then existing from this point of view, and demean themselves conformably to it.

At the close, he notices a special practical difference in the church. But it may be disputed in what light we are to view it. As in the fourteenth chapter he places in opposition those who eat, and those who eat not, and by the latter apparently intends those who scrupled to eat flesh and drink wine, and confined themselves to a vegetable diet, (compare v. 2, and v. 21,) some have been led to conclude,† that in this church a strong ascetic tendency, entirely forbidding animal food and strong drink, had found an entrance, similar to the doctrine of the later Eucra-

* It was by no means the apostles's design in that passage to develop the whole doctrine of the reciprocal duties of rulers and subjects; but he pursues only that one marked antithetical idea to warn Christians against the misapprehension alluded to, and thus leaves all other topics untouched, which otherwise would naturally fall under discussion.

† This view, with various modifications, has been brought forward by Eichorn, in his Introduction to this epistle in his general Introduction to the New Testament, and by Baur in his Essay on this epistle; by the latter in connection with his view of a predominant Jewish Christian tendency in the Roman church, allied to the later Ebionitism, and containing its germ.

tites. Such a tendency, foreign indeed, originally, to the Hebrew and Grecian religious systems, had in that age spread itself in various forms, both among the Jews and Gentiles, owing to the change produced in the spirit of the nations by the breaking up of old forms of thought, and it might have effected a juncture with Christianity, by a mistaken view of the antagonism between the spirit and the flesh, and of the opposition between the world and Christianity. But how can what Paul says on individual cases, be referred to persons under the influence of this tendency? "Let not him that eateth" (he says in v. 3), "*despise* him that eateth not; and let not him who eateth not, *judge* him that eateth;" that is, not condemn, not disallow his participation in the kingdom of God; for persons of this ascetic tendency did not, properly speaking, condemn those who would not consent to such abstinence, but they believed that they were inferior to themselves, and not so far advanced in the perfection of the spiritual life. Paul therefore ought rather to have said, Let not such a one *despise* him that eateth.

Or we must assume that these persons had gone so far as to declare the eating of flesh to be absolutely sinful. But this they could have said only on the principles of a certain dualistic theosophy, which viewed God not as the origin of all creatures; and if Paul had met with such a view, he would certainly not have treated it with so much tolerance, but have felt it his duty to combat it strenuously, as utterly opposed to the principles of Christianity. Nor would the exhortation addressed to the other side not to despise such a one, have been suitable in this case; for persons of this tendency had nothing which exposed them to contempt, but it was rather to be feared that, by such a stricter mode of living, they would be held in greater respect than was their due. Besides, how could Paul say of such a one in v. 6, "He that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks?" Such persons lacked even the disposition to thank God for all the gifts which he had granted for human subsistence. How could he, in reference to such a case, say in v. 21, "It is good neither to eat flesh nor to drink wine, in order to give no offence to a brother?" It could have given no offence to one who was zealous in practising such ascetic severity, if he saw another brother living with less strictness. But if other Christians believed that they ought to follow his example, he might to his injury be confirmed in his delusion, that such a mode of living had something in it excellent or meritorious. Least of all could we suppose that Paul would treat persons of this sort simply as weak, and show them so much indulgence, without combating more decisively the principle that lay at the basis of their error.

And if we do not assume that this principle was an avowed dualism which he must have combated, yet, on any supposition, he could not have acted with so much mildness and forbearance towards an ascetic arrogance of this kind, which was equally in diametric opposition to his doctrine of justification and to the essence of Christian humility. Of such a perversion of religious sentiment, it could not be expected that it

would gradually be overcome by the progressive development of faith as the root of the whole Christian life ; but it was rather to be feared, that a principle so alien to the Christian life, and so much favored by certain mental tendencies of the time, would gather increasing strength, and injure more and more the healthy development of Christianity ; a result which we actually observe in several appearances of this kind in the following age. How very differently does Paul speak against such a tendency in the Epistle to the Colossians ! Evidently the persons towards whom Paul commends forbearance, were those who distinguished certain days as in a special sense dedicated to God, and who could not yet bring themselves to the Christian point of view, that all days ought in like manner to be dedicated to God. We must here recognise the exercise of Jewish principles, (which, since they had their indisputable right in the development of religious truth, and could not be altogether set aside by a single effort, Paul, unless their claims were arrogantly set forth, always treated with indulgence) and we shall find sufficient reason for referring the question of abstinence to the same tendency. We must think, therefore, of the Jewish Christians, who were still strict observers of the Mosaic law, not only in keeping certain days, but also in refraining from certain kinds of food. We shall be less surprised at this, if we recollect that generally the Christians of Jewish descent, particularly those of Palestine, when they lived at Rome, adhered to their former Jewish mode of life. But in the Mosaic laws relative to food, there was nothing, however, that could occasion a scruple about eating flesh or drinking wine, v. 21. Or we must assume that Paul spoke here only hypothetically and hyperbolically, without thinking of a case which might really occur under existing circumstances, although this is not the most probable supposition, judging from his mode of expressing himself.

Further, if we think of those Jewish Christians who believed that the Mosaic laws respecting food were still obligatory, it is entirely clear why Paul must admonish the Gentile Christians, who were fettered by no such scruples, not to despise their weaker Jewish brethren on account of their scrupulosity, nor lead them to act against their consciences, by working on their feelings of shame. But would he have expressed himself so mildly, if these Jewish Christians had ventured to condemn others who partook of food which they held to be prohibited ? In this case, we should have to suppose it to be the opinion of these Jewish Christians, that the Mosaic law was binding on Gentile Christians, and that without its observance they could not be partakers of the kingdom of God. But we know how emphatically Paul always expressed himself against those who maintained such a sentiment, and in doing so, invalidated his doctrine of justification by faith alone. In addition—and on this point we must lay still greater weight—Paul exhorts the strong in faith and the unscrupulous, to take into consideration the necessities of the weak, and rather to refrain from food, which they could partake of without scruple, than give offence to their weaker brethren. But how would

it agree with the principles of this apostle, that he should advise the Gentile Christians to make such a concession, by which they would practically have recognised the obligatory force of the Mosaic law; it was rather his custom to urge on the Gentile Christians not to give place to the Judaizers, who wished to compel them to the observance of the law, but to maintain their Christian freedom against them. In fact, there was no ground for such an exhortation. The Jewish Christians had no cause to be uneasy, because the Gentile Christians did not trouble themselves about the Mosaic laws respecting food. By the stipulation concluded on at the apostolic convention at Jerusalem, the Gentile Christians had been set at liberty from every such restriction. If this gave offence to the Jewish Christians, the offence was unavoidably founded in the evangelical truth itself.

We must therefore think of something, connected indeed with the religious views of the Judaizers, but yet something separable from the observance of the Mosaic law,—something that with more appearance of justice the Jewish Christians might require of their Gentile brethren,—something, in which a concession to the weakness of others might be demanded of Gentile Christians, without encroaching on their Christian freedom. This could be nothing else than abstaining from the flesh of animals offered to idols. With this alone is everything in the passage compatible. It has now a meaning applicable to the circumstances of the time, if we suppose those persons to be spoken of who, in certain cases, preferred to abstain altogether from animal food, and eat only herbs, lest they might unknowingly be in danger of eating something unclean and defiling, the flesh of idolatrous sacrifices. Only in v. 2 does Paul present the extreme contrast: on the one side, a strength of faith which proceeds so far as to banish all scruples respecting the enjoyment of food, and on the other side the extreme of scrupulosity, arising from weakness of faith which would rather eat no meat whatever, than run the risk of eating the flesh of animals offered to idols. Now it is clear also how Paul could say, that if needs be, it would be better not to eat flesh at all, nor to drink wine at all, than to disturb the conscience of a weak brother. We need only recollect that the heathens accompanied their sacrifices with libations;* that the same scruples which existed relative to the meat of the sacrifices, would also arise in reference to the wine of the libation. But that the apostle has not expressly mentioned the sacrifices cannot perplex us in our view of the matter. He had in mind only such readers as would at once understand from his words what he meant; as in ordinary letters, many things are not stated in detail, because it is presumed that the persons to whom they are addressed perfectly understand the allusions.

We must therefore conceive the state of affairs in this church to have

* See the Mishnah in the treatise עֲבֻדָּה זָרָה on idolatrous worship, c. ii. § 3, ed. Surenhus. P. iv. 369, 384.

been similar to that in the Corinthian, which we have already noticed. Some, like the free-thinking Corinthians, gave themselves no concern about the injunction against meat offered to idols, and ridiculed the scrupulosity of the Jewish Christians; others, on the contrary, considered the eating of such food as absolutely sinful, and hence passed sentence of condemnation on those who ventured to eat everything without distinction. Thus also some were still too much accustomed to consider certain days as peculiarly sacred, according to Jewish observances; those who thought more freely, and looked at the subject from the purely Christian point of view, were disposed to make no religious difference between one day and another.*

Such a state of things as this could only exist in a community which was formed similarly to the Corinthian church, which consisted of a majority of Christians of Gentile descent, but with an addition to the original materials of a subordinate Jewish element.† Paul begins his exhortation, without particularly designating the persons he addressed, yet having chiefly in view the more free-thinking Gentile Christians, which also confirms the notion, that these formed the main body of the church. He declares the views of these persons to be correct in theory; but as in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, he censures the want of Christian love in them who so little regarded what affected the welfare of their weaker brethren, and with that defect, the misapprehension of Christian freedom, which was shown in their laying such great stress on what was outward and in itself indifferent, as if the true good of Christians consisted in such things, instead of being something grounded in their inner life, which would remain secure whether they could use or not use these outward things. The participation of the kingdom of God consisted not in meat and drink, (the true possessions and privileges, the true freedom of the members of God's kingdom consisted not in eating or drinking this or that, outward things in general being signified by this expression,) but in the participation of those heavenly possessions of the inner man—righteousness (in the Pauline sense, the designation of the whole relation in which the *ἐκ πίστεως δίκαιος* stands to God,) the heavenly peace flowing from it, the happiness of the divine life, Rom. xiv. 17. He recommends mutual forbearance and love to both parties, that no one should judge another, but each one should seek to be well grounded in his own convictions, and act accordingly; but that the more mature in Christian conviction should condescend to the scruples of those who were not so far advanced, since more is required from the strong than from the weak.

* See page 158.

† It agrees with this view, that in Rom. xv. 7 (a passage closely connected with what goes before), the subject is the agreement between Gentile and Jewish Christians; and that Paul in Rom. xvi. 17, warns them against the common Judaizers, who by the spread of their principles endeavored to excite divisions in such mixed churches.

After Paul had spent three months in Achaia, he wished to depart with the sums collected for the poor church at Jerusalem, and thus to close his apostolic ministry in the East.* This plan was wisely formed

* Though I agree for the most part with Dr. Schneckenburger in what he says (in his oft-mentioned work on the Acts) on the intention of this last journey to Jerusalem; yet I cannot at all assent to what he thinks may be deduced from the silence of the Acts on this collection, and the object of this journey, in favor of the hypothesis which he has advanced. I must also avow myself opposed to Dr. Baur's views, who, since his above-mentioned historico-critical Inquiries on the Object and Occasion of the Epistle to the Romans in the *Tübinger Zeitschrift*, 1836, and his Dissertation on the Origin of Episcopacy in the Christian Church, in the same *Zeitschrift*, 1838, p. 3, proceeding from the same view of the object of the Acts, has gone farther in his deductions, and sought to prove that the author of the Acts misrepresented the facts, and set them in a false light from a one-sided conciliatory apologetic design; see his review of Dr. Schneckenburger in the *Jahrbuch für wissenschaftliche Kritik*. March, 1841. These two critics are struck with the omission of a transaction of so much importance in the historical connexion of events, and hence believe that they must find a special reason for it in the object which the author of the Acts proposed to himself in writing his work. That is, as he was disposed to assume ignorance of the continued division between the Jews and Gentile Christians, and always represents the Jews only, and not the Jewish Christians, as adversaries of the apostle, so he could not adduce anything which might testify against his assumption, or which even by serving to remove the opposition ignored by him, would also imply it; and hence he could not represent this last journey of Paul in its true light. Had we reason to expect in this age of the church, a comprehensive historical representation explaining the causes and connexion of events; if the Acts wore the appearance of such a work; had its author been a Christian Thucydides or Polybius—we might then have admitted the inference, that either he was at too great a distance from the events to know anything of this collection and of the real object of his journey, or that owing to a one-sided bias, he had consciously or unconsciously falsified the history. But such a pragmatistical point of view, which could exist only where the connected development of events could be surveyed with a certain calmness of mind and a certain scientific interest, was totally foreign to the stand-point of Christian history at this time, and especially to that of the Acts. It consists of memoirs, as the author gave them from the sources of information within his reach, or from his own recollection, without following any definite plan. He mentions the last journey of Paul to Jerusalem, on account of the serious consequences to the apostle himself, without reflecting further on the object of it, and so also passed over the collection as being in that view unimportant; his interest was engaged by other objects; and reflections which would only present themselves from a pragmatistical survey of history, were totally absent from his thoughts. This bountiful collection connects itself, however, as a practical proof of what Paul said (Acts xxi. 19) of the success of his ministry among the Gentiles; why should he have been intentionally silent respecting it? If he could say what is mentioned in that passage, without injury to the design imputed to him, he could also say: The presbyters of the church at Jerusalem praised God for kindling such active brotherly love in the hearts of the believing Gentiles. Obviously, moreover, the author of the Acts, by his account in ch. xxi. 21, implies the continued enmity of the Jewish Christians against Paul. I do not see, therefore, what could have induced him designedly to have suppressed earlier facts relating to it. Besides, in Paul's defence in Acts xxiv. 17, there is actually an allusion to the collection, which therefore the author could not have intended to conceal. But if the Acts had been a connected history, or a narrative from one source, this collection, which is only mentioned incidentally, must have been recorded earlier in its place in the regular series of events. It is the greatest perversion (we cannot speak too strongly) to use the want of historic art in a simple book, for the purpose of everywhere

by him, and this his last journey to Jerusalem with the collection is to be viewed as marking an epoch in the development of the church, whose importance we must consider more closely. A year had passed since he had with great zeal set this collection on foot among the churches of Gentile Christians in Asia and Europe, and it was of importance to him that it should be bountiful. He had already written to the Corinthian church, 1 Cor. xvi. 4, that if this collection equalled his wishes, he would convey it himself to Jerusalem. It was certainly not merely his intention to assist the poor of the church at Jerusalem in their temporal necessities; he had an object still more important for the development of the church, to effect a radical cure of the breach between the Jewish and the Gentile Christians, and to seal for perpetuity the unity of the church. As the immediate power of love can effect more to heal the schism of souls, than all formal conferences in favor of union, so the manner in which the Gentile churches evinced their love and gratitude to the mother church, would accomplish what had not yet been attained by all attempts at union. Paul wished, since he was accompanied to Jerusalem by the messengers of these churches, to practically contradict the charges disseminated against him by his Jewish and Judaizing adversaries; the proof of the sympathising and self-sacrificing love of the Gentile Christians was to serve as evidence to the Jewish Christians, who had imbibed prejudices against them, of what could be effected by the preaching of the gospel independently of the law of Moses; so that they would be obliged to acknowledge the operation of God's Spirit among these whom they had always been indisposed to receive as brethren in the faith. Paul himself plainly indicates this to have been his chief object in this collection and journey, (2 Cor. ix. 12—15); that this service of love was not only to relieve the wants of the Christians at Jerusalem, but to excite many hearts to gratitude to God; when they saw how the faith of Gentile Christians had verified itself by this act of kindness, they would feel compelled to praise God for this practical testimony to the gospel, and through the manner in which the grace of God had shown its efficacy among them, being filled with love to them, they would make them objects of their intercessions. A reciprocal communion of prayer in thanksgiving and intercession, was always considered as the mark and seal of genuine Christian brotherhood; he therefore wished to bring about such a union of heart between the Jewish and Gentile Christians. Before he extended his labors for the spread of the church in other lands, he was anxious for the security and stability of the work of which the foundation had been already laid; but which was exposed to the greatest

scenting out with the nose of a one-sided, overweening criticism, *arrières pensées*, to be applied to this modern tendency-seeking, and plan-making. What, according to such a method, may not be found in the Church History of Eusebius, if one is only accustomed to hear the grass grow!

danger on the side of that earliest controversy, which was always threatening to break forth again.

Yet it all depended on this, whether the apostle of the Gentiles could succeed in carrying his wisely formed plan into effect ; he was well aware what hindrances and dangers obstructed his progress. It was questionable whether the power of love would succeed in overcoming the narrow-heartedness of the Jewish spirit, and induce the Jewish Christians to receive as brethren the Gentile brethren who accompanied him. And what had he to expect from the Jews, when he, after they had heard so much of his labors among the Gentiles, which had excited their fanatical hatred,—personally appeared among them, he who in his youth had been known as a zealous champion of Pharisaism, now accompanied by uncircumcised Gentiles as messengers from Gentile churches, whose equal birthright to the kingdom of the Messiah he zealously advocated ? Fully alive to the difficulties and dangers which he must overcome in order to attain his great object, he entreated the Roman Christians for their intercessory prayers, that he might be delivered from the unbelievers among the Jews, and that this service might be well received by the Christians at Jerusalem, that he might come to them from thence with joy and be refreshed by them. Rom. xv. 31, 32.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE FIFTH AND LAST JOURNEY OF PAUL TO JERUSALEM—ITS IMMEDIATE CONSEQUENCES—HIS IMPRISONMENT IN PALESTINE.

AFTER staying three months in Achaia, Paul departed from Corinth in the spring of the year 58 or 59, about the time of the Jewish Passover. His companions went before him to Troas, and he first visited Philippi. As he earnestly wished to be in Jerusalem at the Pentecost, it was necessary to hasten his journey ; on that account he did not venture to go to Ephesus, but sent from Miletus for the overseers of the Ephesian church, and probably those of other neighboring churches of Lesser Asia,* to come to him, that in the anticipation of the great dan-

* We cannot conclude with certainty from Paul's farewell address to the overseers of the church, which is given in the 20th chapter of the Acts, that the overseers of other churches in Lesser Asia, besides those of Ephesus, were present on that occasion. The words in Acts xx. 25, "among whom I have gone," *ἐν οἷς διήλθον*, may, it is true, favor this supposition, since they denote rather travelling through a certain district, than a continued residence in one place ; but these words may also be fairly understood of the apostle's circuits within the city of Ephesus, and the visits he paid to the houses of the presbyters. The singular, "the flock," *τὸ ποίμνιον*, v. 28, 29, leads us to think most nat-

gers that awaited him, he might pour forth his heart to them perhaps for the last time, and utter the parting words of fatherly love.* We

usually of only one church, though it may be here used respectively, and refer to several churches. It is worthy of notice, that Irenæus applies it to the overseers of distinct churches, and he speaks of it in very decided language. "In Mileto convocatis episcopis et presbyteris, qui erant ab Epheso, et *reliquis proximis civitatibus*," (the bishops and elders having been called together at Miletus, from Ephesus, and *other neighboring cities*), iii. c. 14, § 2. Judging from the character of Irenæus and his times, it is not probable that he would be induced simply by that expression in Paul's address, to deviate from the letter of the narrative in the Acts. Hence we might rather suppose, that Irenæus was decided in giving a different representation by historical traditions or documents with which he had become acquainted in Lesser Asia. Yet the bias of the episcopal system (which was then germinating) might, perhaps, occasion a different construction of the passage from that which the literal narrative would warrant, independently of any tradition. Paul applies to the presbyters the epithet "overseers," *ἐπίσκοποι*; now it could not then be surprising to find the *ἐπίσκοποι* designated "presbyters," for this latter name was still the generic term by which both might be denoted, but the name *ἐπίσκοποι* was already exclusively applied to the first church governors, the presidents of the college of presbyters. Since, then, we proceed on the supposition that this institution of the church government was the same from the beginning, we must hence conclude from the name *ἐπίσκοποι* that the bishops of other churches were present at this meeting, and hence Irenæus says expressly "*episcopis et presbyteris*."

But if we admit that this meeting consisted of the overseers of the various churches in Lesser Asia, the discrepancy between the three years, Acts xx. 31, and the two years and three months of the duration of Paul's stay at Ephesus according to Luke's narrative, would cease; for we might then suppose, that Paul, before he went to Ephesus, spent nine months in other places of Lesser Asia, where he founded churches.

* Dr. Baur and Dr. Schneckenburger think that it can be shown, that this address in the 20th chapter of the Acts was not delivered by Paul in its present form, but that it was framed by the author of the Acts, on the same plan as the whole of his history, according to the conciliatory, apologetic tendency already noticed. We would not indeed pledge ourselves that the address was taken down as Paul delivered it, with official accuracy—but that it has been faithfully reported in its essential contents, and that a sketch of it was in existence earlier than the whole of the Acts. Not only do we find nothing in it which does not correspond to the situation and feelings of the apostle, but it also contains several marks of not being cast in the same mould as the whole of the Acts. Among these marks we reckon the mention of the three years, ch. xx. 31, which does not agree with the reckoning in the Acts, the mention of teaching "from house to house," v. 20, and of the warning voices of the prophets, v. 23. (Schneckenburger, indeed, considers this to be a prolepsis, and finds in it a mark of non-originality; but it is not at all improbable, that already in the churches with which Paul had stayed, he had received warnings of the dangers that threatened him from the fanatical rage of the Jews, though Luke, who did not accompany Paul everywhere, has not mentioned this in his brief narrative). Besides, when Paul speaks of a higher necessity, by which he felt compelled to go to Jerusalem "bound in spirit," we may infer that this journey, undertaken for what he considered the work committed to him by the Lord, had a greater significance and importance, as appears from the explanation we have already given, but which is not so represented in the Acts. If this address indicates that it was delivered before delegates from various Asiatic churches, we may also number this among the marks. Baur, indeed, (p. 181), finds the mark of a later period in the circumstance that Paul allowed only the presbyters to come as representatives of the churches; but we cannot admit the correctness of this opinion. Without anything of the later hierarchical tendency, they could be so regarded. And since he

recognise in this farewell address, in which Paul's heart, thoroughly imbued with the love of Christ, expresses itself in so affecting a manner, his fatherly anxiety for the churches, whose overseers heard his warning voice for the last time, and whom he was about to leave at a time full of sad and dark foreboding, when many dangers threatened pure Christianity.

He could not foresee with certainty what consequences would result from his journey to Jerusalem, for these depended on a combination of circumstances too intricate for any human sagacity to unravel. But yet he could not be unaware of what the fanatical rage of the Jewish zealots threatened, and what it might perpetrate, under the maladministration of the worthless Procurator Felix, who combined the meanness of a slave with the caprice of a tyrant;* at Jerusalem, too, where might prevailed against right, and assassins (the notorious Sicarii) acted as the tools of any party who were base enough to employ them. In the churches which he had visited on his journey hither, many individuals had warned him in inspired language of the danger that threatened him at Jerusalem, and thereby confirmed what his own presentiments, as well as his sagacity, led him to expect, similar to those sad anticipations which he had expressed when he was last at Corinth; Rom. xv. 31.

could not arrange for all to come, was it not most natural that he should choose these, especially since they had to watch over the whole of the churches? And that this office was assigned by Paul to the presbyters is evident from those epistles of which the genuineness is admitted by Baur himself; from the idea of "government," *κυβερνήσις*, 1 Cor. xii. 28; of "ruling," *προϊστάμενος*, Rom. xii. 8; from what Paul says in 1 Cor. xvi. 15, 16, respecting the relation of the churches to those who have to fill ecclesiastical offices; in which words might be also found from Baur's point of view, the marks of a later age.

We would not indeed attach equal weight to all those marks appealed to in support of the originality of such a farewell speech; yet taken collectively, their testimony appears to prove something. And if Luke had before him an earlier written draft of Paul's address, containing the presentiment he expressed of his impending death, I do not see how any one is justified in maintaining that Paul could not have uttered it, in case this anticipation had not been fulfilled. According to truth, he must have allowed him to speak as he actually spoke. But it could not be any difficulty to Luke or to the persons for whom the record of those memorable occasions was in the first place designed, if a presentiment of Paul's respecting his impending fate was not fulfilled in its full extent. Infallible foreknowledge of future events was certainly, according to the Christian idea of that age, not among the marks of a genuine apostle, and the contrary is rather implied in Paul's own words, v. 22. He speaks in a somewhat dubious tone of the fate that awaited him. Whoever might have forged, after the event, an address of Paul's, would have made him speak in a very different and more decided tone. We do not see how Baur can infer from the passage of Paul's epistles, in which he speaks with sanguine hopes of the consequences to be expected from his journey to Jerusalem, that Paul could not at that time have so spoken. Who can calculate the alterations of feeling in a human soul? Especially does it make a difference whether he wrote his epistle several months before, (and yet he anticipated even then the dangers that awaited him, Rom. xv. 31, a passage indeed not admitted as genuine by Baur,) or gave this parting address as he was going to meet the expected end of his journey, after he had received many prophetic warnings.

* Of whom Tacitus says: "Per omnem sævitiam ac libidinem jus regium servili ingenio exeruit." Hist. v. 9.

There are especially two warnings and exhortations relative to the future, which he addressed to the overseers of the church, and enforced by the example of his own labors during three years' residence among them. He foresaw, that false teachers from other parts would insinuate themselves into these churches, and that even among themselves such would arise and gain many adherents.* He exhorts them, therefore, to watch that the doctrine of salvation, which he had faithfully published to them for so long a period, might be preserved in its purity. The false teachers whom he here pointed out were most probably distinct from the class of common Judaizers; for in churches in which the Gentile Christians, that is, the Hellenic element,† so predominated as in those of Lesser Asia, such persons could not be so dangerous; and particularly when such false teachers were described as proceeding from the bosom of the church itself, it must be presumed that these heretical tendencies must have developed themselves from a mixture with Christianity of the mental elements already existing in the church. Might not Paul's experience during his long stay in Lesser Asia, have given him occasion to feel these anxieties for the future? As immediately after announcing the danger that threatened the church, he reminded them that for three years he had not ceased, day or night, to warn each one among them with tears, we may infer that he had at that time cause thus to address the consciences of their overseers, and to warn them so impressively against the adulteration of Christian truth. We here see the first omens indicated by the apostle of a new conflict which awaited pure Christianity, a point to which we shall recur again further on.‡ At the close of his address, Paul refers them to the example of disinterested and self-denying love, which he had given them:—he had required of them neither gold, nor silver, nor raiment, but as they well knew, had provided for his own temporal wants and those of his followers by the labor of

* It is possible, that v. 30 may refer to the presbyters personally, and the words may be so understood that the false teachers would proceed from their own body; but since the presbyters appear as representatives of the churches, it is not necessary to make the reference so confined. It may be properly taken in a more general sense, that false teachers would not only find entrance into the churches from other places, but also proceed from among these churches themselves.

† Schneckenburger, p. 136, objects against this remark, that in the Gentile-Christian Galatian churches, Judaizing false teachers could produce the greatest confusion; but the degree of Grecian cultivation in Galatia and at Ephesus makes a difference here.

‡ As from what is said in the text it is easily shown, that Paul must have held such a warning against the propagation of new perversions of Christian truth to be called for; so I can find no ground whatever for Baur's again repeated assertion that Paul could not have so spoken. Paul knew well that, for the protection of the genuine, there must be opposition between the genuine and the spurious, there must arise divisions, 1 Cor. xi. 19. When he says that all these troubles, which were already growing in the germ, and which had been kept back through his constant influence in the churches would break out after his departure, this language is appropriate in the mouth of Paul, and furnishes no mark whatever of a confusion of times on the part of him who may have ascribed these words to Paul.

his own hands. These words are admirably suited to the close of the address. By reminding the presbyters of the proofs of his disinterested love, and of his zeal which shunned no toil and no privation for the salvation of souls, he gave still greater weight to his exhortations. The 33d verse is closely connected with the 31st, where he reminds them of his labors among them for their souls, and in both verses he holds out his own example for their imitation. He expresses this still more clearly in the words, "I have showed you all things (or in every way), how that so laboring, ye ought to support the weak,* and remember the words of the Lord Jesus: 'It is more blessed to give than to receive.'" It conveyed the exhortation, that in the discharge of their office they should avoid all appearance of selfishness, that they should rather earn their own livelihood, and give up their claim to what they had a right to expect from the church to which they had consecrated their powers. He impressed this upon them in the most delicate manner, since he does not use the express form of exhortation, but presents his example for imitation under similar circumstances. Paul indeed declares elsewhere, that the preachers of the gospel, as Christ himself had expressed it, were entitled to receive their maintenance from the churches for whose spiritual welfare they labored. And it may appear strange that he here departs from this rule, and that he should here prescribe to all the presbyters what elsewhere he has represented as an exception arising out of very peculiar circumstances, and as something suited only to his individual position.† But there is a difference between the circumstances of itinerant missionaries and those of the overseers of churches whose activity at first was not so claimed by their pastoral duties as to prevent their carrying on at the same time their former secular employment;‡ and if they thus labored with self-sacrificing love, without any appearance of selfishness, their authority and influence, which would be required to counteract the false teachers, would be much increased.

* Certainly the "weak," *ἀσθενεῖς*, in Acts xx. 35, are not those who needed help in respect of their bodily wants; in that case, why should not a more definite word be used? Neither does the connexion suit such an interpretation, for Paul does not say that he labored that he might be able to give to the poor, or that he might support his poor associates in the ministry; but that the church might not be obliged to contribute, either to them or to him, any thing for their support. And this manifestly in order that every occasion might be taken from the weak, who were not sufficiently established in Christian principles, who would be easily disposed to entertain the suspicion of private advantage. The use of the word "weak" in 2 Cor. xi. 29, also favors this interpretation, and what he assigns in both the Epistles to the Corinthians as the reasons of such conduct. Thus also this exhortation stands in closer connexion with what goes before; for if the presbyters avoided all appearance of selfishness, they would have a firmer hold on the general confidence, and thus, like Paul himself in reference to the Judaizers, could more successfully oppose the false teachers, who endeavored for their own ends to excite mistrust of the existing teachers and guides of the church.

† For which reason Schneckenburger thinks it improbable that Paul should have so expressed himself.

‡ See pages 34, 149, 153.

In this whole address, as suited the feelings and aim of one who was probably taking a last farewell of his spiritual children, the hortatory element is throughout predominant; if we at the same time suppose an apologetic element, which is very doubtful, it is at all events quite subordinate to the hortatory. It is very improbable, that when he spoke of his own disinterestedness, he intended to repel the accusations of his Judaizing adversaries; for though he was obliged to answer such charges in writing to the Corinthians, we are not to infer that a similar exculpation of himself was required in all the churches. With greater reason we may find in what he says of the completeness of his teaching in the doctrines of salvation, a reference to the accusations of his Judaizing opponents, of which we have so often spoken. But even this is very doubtful; for in any case, without an apologetic design, and simply to excite the presbyters to fidelity in holding fast the pure doctrine which they had received, he would of necessity remind them how important he had felt it to keep back nothing from them that was necessary for salvation, and that he was free from blame if, after all, they should not faithfully preserve the doctrine made known to them.*

Such an address could not but make a deep impression on their hearts, of which we have a simple and striking description in the Acts xx. 36-38.

When Paul arrived at Cesaræa (Stratonis), within two days' journey of Jerusalem, he was warned anew of the dangers that threatened him. The members of the church and his companions united their entreaties that he would be careful of his life, and not proceed any further. But though he was far from the enthusiastic zeal that panted for martyrdom, though he never neglected any methods of Christian prudence, in order to preserve his life for the service of his Lord and of the Church, yet as he himself declared, he counted his life as nothing, if required to sacrifice it in the ministry entrusted to him. However much a heart so tenderly susceptible, so open to all pure human emotions as his, must have been moved by the tears of his friends, who loved him as their spiritual father, yet he suffered not his resolution to be shaken, but resisted all these impressions, in order to follow the call of duty; he left all events to the will of the Lord, in which at last his Christian brethren concurred.

The reception which Paul met with at Jerusalem must have been different according to the various materials of the Christian church, which

* Baur with his fixed idea of a designed parallelism between Peter and Paul, in support of which he confesses that nothing can be found elsewhere in the address, will at least find in *these words* a point of connexion for it; but certainly no one who does not contemplate everything in the light of such a fixed idea will find in the words any reference to such a parallel. The language of Baur is: "It is as if the perfect candor exhibited in the apostolic ministrations, and which the Jewish Christians would make conspicuous in their Peter, in order to defend him against the reproach of duplicity, Gal. ii 12, must also be claimed for the apostle Paul."

at that place was mixed with Jews. We must here suppose the transition from Judaism to Christianity in manifold gradations, though all the members, notwithstanding the greatest differences on other points, were bound to one another by the common faith that Jesus was the Messiah. The most important point of difference, which, as we shall see, lasted to later times,* was this,—those who, along with their faith in Jesus as the Messiah, still held fast to the Jewish views, but at the same time acknowledged the free development of Christianity among the heathen, on whose privileges they imposed no restraints; on the other side were those who were never disposed to consider the uncircumcised who did not observe the Mosaic law, as equal partakers with themselves of the kingdom of God. We can hardly be surprised at this when we recollect that the number of believing Jews is reckoned in Acts xxi. 20 as amounting to many myriads,† though this is not to be regarded as an exact enumeration, and those who came up to the feast from other parts must be taken into account. But we cannot venture to draw an inference from the small number of Christians among the Jews‡ in the third century, respecting the relative proportions at this period.§ The powerful impression of Christ's appearance continued to operate on many; and whatever among the body of the people was opposed to faith in him, the contrariety that was consciously felt between the spirit of Christ and their carnal views now vanished, since they could depict a Messiah according to their mind, in him whose personal image no longer stood before their eyes; and what they had been wont to expect from the Messiah, they transferred to Christ, whose speedy return they anticipated to found his kingdom in the world. Among many of this class nothing was to be found peculiarly Christian, and they distinguished themselves from other Jews only by acknowledging Jesus as the Messiah. Hence, the spiritual superiors of the people gave themselves no further concern about such a Christianity, and allowed it to remain undisturbed. But it was quite natural that such people, when their Messianic expectations were not fulfilled, should apostatize altogether from the faith.

Those who were more thoroughly imbued with the spirit of the gos-

* See Justin. Dial. c. Tryph. f. 265, 66, ed. Colon. 1686.

† If the author of the Acts was desirous of removing the distinction between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians, it certainly was not to his purpose to put the former of these nearer to the Jews themselves. And an author of a later day, when the number of Christians among the Jews was very much diminished, would hardly have had occasion to make so many of them.

‡ Origen says, T. i. in Joann. § 2, that the number of believing Jews in the whole world did not amount to so many as one hundred and forty thousand.

§ Hegesippus also says in Eusebius ii. 23, Πολλῶν καὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων πιστεύοντων ἡ θόρυβος τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ γραμματέων καὶ φαρισαίων λεγόντων, ὅτι κινδυνεύει πᾶς ὁ λαὸς Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστὸν προσδοκᾶν. (Many of the rulers, also, having believed, there was an uproar of the Jews, of both Scribes and Pharisees, who said there was danger that all the people would expect Jesus as the Messiah.)

pel, the more enlightened among the Jewish Christians, received Paul with Christian brotherly love.*

The next day after his arrival at Jerusalem, Paul with his companions visited James the brother of the Lord, at whose house the presbyters of the church were assembled. They listened with great interest to his account of the effects of the gospel among the Gentiles. But James called his attention to the fact, that a great number of Jews who believed on Jesus as the Messiah, and were yet zealous and strict observers of the Mosaic law, were prejudiced against him; for those Judaizers, who everywhere sought to injure Paul's ministry, had circulated in Jerusalem the charge against him, that, not content with releasing the believing Gentiles from the observance of the Mosaic law, he had required of the Jews who lived among them not to circumcise their children, and not to observe the law. This charge, so brought forward, was certainly false; for Paul combated the outward observances of Judaism only so far as the justification and sanctification of men were made to depend upon them. It was his principle, that no one should relinquish the earthly national and civil relations in which he stood at his conversion, unless for important reasons; and on this principle he allowed the Jews to retain their peculiarities, among which was the observance of the Mosaic law; 1 Cor. vii. 18. But it could not fail to happen, that those who entered into the Pauline ideas of the relation of the law to the gospel, and were thereby freed from scrupulosity in the observance of the former, were led into a freer line of conduct in this respect, and some might go further than Paul wished in the indulgence of their inclinations. Such instances as these might have given occasion to the charge that he had seduced the Jewish Corinthians to release themselves from the law. It is indeed true,† that when once this was generally acknowledged, that circumcision was of no avail for obtaining a part in God's kingdom, it would sooner or later fall into disuse. But in that principle all the apostles agreed, as appears from what has been said above, even had we made no use at all of the accounts in the Acts. According to the principle in which both parties were unanimous, the two different forms of the church among Jews and Gentiles springing from natural and national distinctions as well as from the process of historical development, existed for some time side by side. As the apostles among the Jews acknowledged the free agency of the Holy Spirit among the Gentiles, and allowed the

* In reference, also, to this part of the history, we must maintain the same view which has hitherto approved itself to us in making use of the Acts; namely, that the difficulties it presents in attempting to obtain an historical representation from it, do not proceed from any designed object on the part of the author, but on the contrary, from the want of pragmatism, (*i. e.* a clear exhibition of causes and consequences,) the rude collocation of facts, so that the narrator never placed himself in the position of other persons, to answer questions which must occur to them in order to explain the connexion of the facts. Hence we are obliged to supply many things by historical combination before we can obtain an intelligible history.

† To which Baur gives prominence.

churches founded among them to be formed in their own way without interference of theirs,* so Paul also allowed the church among the Jews to develop itself freely in their way. In the natural historical process of development no violent encroachments were made on either side. And why could not both peculiar ecclesiastical forms exist together for a length of time, though the distinction must be obliterated by the progressive development of the church?

Without departing from the principles of strict truthfulness, Paul could repel those charges to which we have referred, for he was very far from wishing to anticipate in an arbitrary manner the historical development; it was with him an avowed principle that every man should abide in those relations which belonged to him when the call of Christianity reached him, and no one should wilfully renounce them. He was far from that hatred against Judaism, and the ancient theocratic people, of which his violent opponents accused him. On the principles which he avowed in his epistles, according to which, to the Jews he became a Jew, to the Gentiles a Gentile, and weak to the weak, he declared himself equally ready to do what James proposed,† to refute that charge by an overt act, by taking part in the Jewish cultus in a mode which was highly esteemed by pious Jews.‡ He joined himself to four members of the church, who had undertaken a Nazarite's vow for seven days. He submitted to the same restraints, and informed the priests that he would be answerable for the expense of the offerings that were to be presented on the accomplishment of the purification.§ But though he

* Irenæus iii. 12, 15, presents this point of view well: *Hi autem qui circa Jacobum apostoli gentibus quidem libere agere permittebant, concedentes nos Spiritui Dei. Ipsi vero eundem scientes Deum perseverabant in pristinis observationibus.* (But those apostles who followed James, allowed the Gentiles to act freely, giving us up to the Spirit of God. Yet they themselves, knowing the same God, continued in their former observances). He adds the following words, which in respect to freedom of historical apprehension are noteworthy: *ita ut et Petrus quoque, timens ne culparetur ab ipsis, ante manducans cum gentibus, cum tamen advenissent quidam ab Jacobo, separavit se et non manducavit cum eis.* (So that even Peter also, who had previously eaten with Gentiles, when certain ones came from James, fearing lest he should be blamed by them, separated himself from the Gentiles and would not eat with them.)

† We must not interpret too rigidly the words of James when he desires Paul (Acts xxi. 24) by that act to prove that he also lived in the observance of the law; we obtain their correct meaning by contrasting them with the charge made by the Jews. The view, according to which Paul to "those without law," *ἀνόμοι*, became "one without law," *ἀνομος*, was indeed different from that of James, and we know not whether James and Paul referred particularly to the special difference existing between themselves. There are many differences on which it is better to be silent than to express our opinion.

‡ Josephus, *Archæol.* xix. 6, § 1.

§ The common supposition that Paul joined himself to these Nazarenes, when they had yet seven days, Acts xxi. 27, to continue their abstinence for the discharge of their vow, and that during this time he kept the vow with them, is at variance with the mention of twelve days, Acts xxiv. 11, for in that case there must have been seventeen days. It is indeed in itself possible, that Paul did not reckon in the five days which he spent in confinement at Caesarea, since they signified nothing for his object; but this is not implied

might have satisfied by this means the minds of the better disposed among the Jewish Christians, the inveterate zealots among the Jews were not at all conciliated.* On the contrary, they were only the more incensed, that the man who, as they said, had everywhere taught the Gentiles to blaspheme the people of God, the law, and the temple, had ventured to take a part in the Jewish religious service. They had seen a Gentile Christian, Trophimus, in company with him, and hence the fanatics concluded that he had taken a Gentile with him into the temple and defiled it. A violent tumult instantly arose, and Paul was rescued from the enraged multitude only by means of the Roman tribune, who hastened to the spot with a band of soldiers from the *Arx Antonia* situated over against the temple, the quarters of the Roman garrison.

Paul was on the point of being scourged, (a common mode of torture among the Romans,) for the purpose of extorting a confession respecting the cause of this tumult, but by declaring himself a Roman citizen he was saved from this ignominy. The tribune now endeavored to reach the bottom of the case, that he might send Paul to appear before the Sanhedrim. The manner in which the apostle conducted himself on this occasion, shows him to have been the man who knew how to control the agitation of his feelings by a sober judgment, and to avail himself of circumstances with Christian prudence, without any compromise of truth. When he was suddenly carried away by the impulse of righteous indignation to speak with greater warmth than he intended, he was able to recover the mastery of his feelings, and to act in a manner becoming his vocation. In a moment of excitement at the arbitrary conduct of the high priest Ananias, while thinking only of the person and losing sight of the office whose duties had been violated, he had used intemperate expressions though containing truth;† but on being informed that it was the high priest whom he had so addressed, he at once corrected himself

in what he has said. There remains, therefore, nothing else but to assume, that the seven days denote a definite number of days, to which at that time the Nazarites' vow used to extend, and that Paul had joined the Nazarites on one of the last of these days. But on the other hand, in the section of the Mishnah on the Nazarites' vow, the number of thirty days is mentioned as the fixed term for this oath. As to the seven days mentioned in Numbers vi., they are not applicable to the present case; for they refer to the case of a person who, during the time of his vow, has defiled himself, and who, after the interval of seven days' purification, begins his vow afresh.

* I find no reason for assuming with Baur, that the machinations against Paul proceeded chiefly from the Jewish Christians, and to charge the author of the Acts with falsifying a matter of fact. But I consider it possible that, among the great multitude of Jew-Christians, some might be found to whom their Judaism was more important than the little Christianity they possessed, and that such persons would make common cause with the Jewish zealots against Paul.

† The manner in which Paul here comes before us in the Acts, corresponds most exactly to his character, as we learn it from his epistles, combining a warmth of temperament with a wisdom which knew how to turn every circumstance to the best account. A later writer, attempting to fabricate a story, would not have represented Paul as speaking in the way mentioned in Acts xxiii. 3.

and said, he had not considered that it was the high priest, to whom reverence certainly was due according to the law.* In order to secure the voice of the majority among his judges, he availed himself of that means† for the victory of truth, which has been often used against it—the *divide et impera* in a good sense; he enlisted on his side the bias for that truth by the acknowledgment of which the greater number of his judges really approached nearer to him, than the few who denied it, in order to produce a division in the assembly. He could say with truth, that he was brought to trial because he had testified of the hope of Israel, of the resurrection of the dead, for he had preached Jesus as the personage by whom this hope was fulfilled. These words had the effect of uniting the Pharisees present in his favor, and of involving them in a warm debate with the Sadducees, to whom the high priest himself belonged.‡ The former could find no fault in him. If he had said that

* We need not be perplexed with the "I wist not," ἤδεν οὐκ in Acts xxiii. 5. The very turn of the expression shows us that Paul in his momentary embarrassment, and regretting his intemperate language, only sought to apologise, and the words, as the bystanders would be aware, are not to be taken too stringently.

† Everything here is exactly to the life. To fabricate this would require a talent for description different from what the author of the Acts possessed. Paul might have had in his thoughts another line of defence; but after he had allowed himself to be carried away by his warmth, and had returned from the digression, he chose this prudential method in order to give a favorable turn to his cause.

‡ Baur thinks that this representation of the transaction as we take it from the Acts, must be regarded as unhistorical throughout. It is an entire distortion of the question in dispute which Paul here allows himself, and inconsistent with his love of truth; and the dispute thus called forth between the Pharisees and Sadducees is something altogether improbable. "Parties who differed from one another on such essential points, but who nevertheless so frequently met in society, and were united in the same official body, must have so long exhausted themselves respecting their points of difference, that it was impossible they could, on every occasion, make them afresh the subjects of the most violent dispute, least of all in such a case, in which, as in the one before us, the easily detected stratagem of an opponent would be made use of in the dispute to his own advantage." As to the first point, I do not see why Paul, setting out from his own subjective train of thought, could not bring forward that side of the controversy from which his own cause must appear in a favorable light to a majority of his judges, while he kept in the background the other points in dispute. It was not a false connexion, but one perfectly corresponding to the truth according to his convictions. Ever since he had testified among the Gentiles of Jesus the Risen One as the foundation of the whole Gospel, he had been the object of the most violent attacks of the Jews. This faith involved everything else that belonged to this controversy. Whether the hope of a resurrection to eternal life would be fulfilled, depended on the question whether Jesus was the Messiah, and whether he had really risen. Paul was conscious that he testified of the reality of all the hopes of the pious under the Old Covenant, and that he was a truly orthodox Jew. This he asserted with unwavering conviction. This was a line of conduct by which he occupied the position of his opponents, and obliged them to acknowledge what he maintained to be true—a method which perfectly suited Paul's rhetoric and dialectic.

As to the second point, we know indeed that the Sadducees gladly retired from public offices, and whenever they occupied them, felt obliged, from regard to popular opinion, to accommodate themselves to the maxims of the Pharisees. (Πρόσχωροῦσι οἷς ὁ Φαρισαῖος

the spirit of a deceased person or that an angel had appeared to him (the appearance of the risen Jesus)—whatever he might mean by this, and whether what he averred were true or not, they did not pretend to determine, nor trouble themselves about it—at all events, they could not criminate him on this account.* The tribune of the Roman cohort at last saw himself obliged, by the plots of Paul's enemies against his life, to send him under an escort to the metropolis of the province, Cæsarea, and to transfer the whole affair to the Procurator Felix, who resided there.

The accusation which the Sanhedrim was allowed to bring by counsel against him, was the only one which, according to the privileges secured to the Jews by the Roman laws, could with any show of reason be made, namely, that he everywhere disturbed the Jews in the enjoyment of these privileges, the peaceful exercise of their cultus,—that he excited disturbances and divisions among them, and that at last he had dared to desecrate the temple. The tribune was accused of preventing the Jews from judging Paul according to the privileges secured to them by law. Felix, who was not disposed to meddle with the internal disputes of the Jews, perceived no fault in the accused, and hence must at once have set him at liberty, if he had not hoped, as it was his constant practice to make justice venal, to obtain money from him; but as Paul was not willing to purchase his freedom by such an unlawful method, which would cast suspicion both on himself and his cause, Felix, in order to gain favor with the Jews on leaving them, to whom he had been sufficiently obnoxious, left him in confinement, and thus he remained for two years till the arrival of the new Procurator, M. Porcius Festus.†

λέγει, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἄλλως ἀνεκτοὺς γεινέσθαι τοῖς πλήθεσιν. Joseph. Antiq. l. xviii. c. 1, § 4.) But the warmth of party feeling could easily gain the ascendancy over cold-blooded politics, and the forcibly restrained spite between the two parties would readily break out again on many occasions. It might very possibly happen that, owing to the quite tumultuary manner in which matters had been carried on against Paul, the leaders of the people had not yet learned what was the *corpus delicti* in his case; and since the Pharisees had always heard him assert that Jesus the Risen One had appeared to him, they fixed their attention on that one point, because their controversy with the Sadducees, which to them was far more important, became the subject of discussion.

* The words "let us not fight against God," *μὴ θεομαχῶμεν*, Acts xxiii. 9, are certainly a gloss, and a gloss at variance with the general tenor of the passage, for this was certainly more than the Pharisees could be willing to say from their point of view.

† If the precise time at which Felix was recalled, and Festus received the government of the province, could be exactly determined, we should have an important chronological mark; but this period cannot be so exactly determined. The chronological data on which we here proceed, are the following. When Felix laid down the procuratorship, he was accused at Rome, as Josephus (*Archæol.* xx. 8, § 9) relates, by the Jews, on account of the oppressions he had practised, and would have been punished if he had not been delivered by the intercession of his brother Pallas, who just at that time had much influence with the emperor. But Pallas was poisoned by Nero in the year 62, see Tacit. *Annal.* xiv. 65. This enables us to fix the extreme *terminus ad quem* of the recall of Felix. But according to the narrative of Tacitus, Pallas had long before lost his influence,

Paul had for a long time previous to this event entertained the thought of preaching the gospel in the metropolis of the world. But it was now uncertain whether he would ever attain the fulfilment of this inward call; but on the night after he had borne testimony to his faith before the assembled Sanhedrim, the Lord imparted the assurance to him by a vision, that as he had been his witness in the capital of the Jewish world, he should also be the same in that of the Gentile world. It was this which confirmed him in his resolution, when the procurator was about to sacrifice him to the wishes of the Jewish Sanhedrim, of seeking deliverance by an appeal to the emperor. The arrival at Cæsarea of the young King Agrippa II., as a person acquainted with the Jews and their religion, was acceptable to Festus, since he hoped that by admitting Paul to an examination in his presence, he could learn something more decisive in this affair, which might be communicated in his report to Rome. Paul appeared before so numerous and august an assembly, before the Roman procurator and the Jewish king, with exultation at the thought of being able to testify of what filled his heart before such an audience. He addressed himself especially to King Agrippa, in whom, through their common acquaintance with the Jewish faith, he could hope to find more points of connexion than in a heathen magistrate. He narrated how he had been educated in zealous attachment to Pharisaic principles, and from a violent persecutor had, by a call from the Lord himself, become a devoted preacher of the gospel,—that in obeying this call up to that time

(*Annal.* xiii. 14.) At the beginning of his reign, Nero had removed Pallas from the office he held under Claudius, and treated him with displeasure. And since Josephus says that when Pallas interceded for his brother Felix he stood in favor with the emperor, it follows, that the recall of Felix must have taken place in the beginning of Nero's reign, which can by no means be admitted. What Josephus says in the history of his life, of his own journey to Rome in his six-and-twentieth year, gives no sure foundation for determining the time when Felix laid down his office. Schrader thinks indeed, that he can find a decisive chronological mark in this, that something which Josephus puts in connexion with the entrance of Festus into office, was decided by the influence of Poppæa, already married to Nero, (*Joseph. Archæol.* xx. 8, § 1); for it would follow that since Nero, according to Tacitus, married Poppæa in 62, Festus must have entered on his government about this time. But the words of Josephus, xiv. 60, "about this time" *κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τούτων*, cannot avail for exactly determining the time; Poppæa, long before her marriage to Nero, had great influence over him, as appears from the words of Tacitus, *Annal.* xiv. 60: "Ea diri pellex et adulteri Neronis, mox mariti potens," (She, a mistress of the detestable and adulterous Nero, afterwards influential with him as her husband,) and may have already at an earlier day accomplished much by interceding with the emperor. We need not attach much weight to the circumstance that Josephus calls her at that time the wife of Nero. But in all this, much uncertainty attaches to the chronology of events, and the supposition that Felix laid down his office in the year 62, and therefore that Paul's confinement took place in 60, is by no means sufficiently proved. We may therefore safely place it some years earlier. If Paul was set at liberty from his confinement at Rome, we must necessarily admit the earlier date; for if his confinement at Rome had been contemporaneous with the great conflagration, he would certainly have fallen a sacrifice to the fury then excited against the Christians.

he had testified before Jews and Gentiles, great and small, but had published nothing else than what Moses and the prophets had foretold; why then do you doubt that the Messiah should suffer, that he should rise from the dead, and by the assurance of an everlasting divine life diffuse light among Jews and Gentiles? This he might presume was admitted by the king as an acknowledged article of faith, but it must appear utterly strange to the Romans; strange also must the religious inspiration with which Paul uttered all this appear to the cold-hearted Roman statesman. He could see nothing in it but fanatical delusion. "Too much Jewish learning," he exclaimed, "hath made thee mad." But with calm confidence Paul replied, "I am not mad, but speak the words of truth and soberness!" and, turning to Agrippa, he called upon him as a witness, since he well knew that these things were not done in any corner of the earth, in secret, but publicly at Jerusalem. And with a firm conviction, that, in all he had testified, the promises of the prophets were fulfilled, he said to the king, "Believest thou the prophets? I know that thou believest!" Agrippa, offended by Paul's confidence, answered, "Truly in a short time* thou wilt make me a Christian." Paul, with his fetters on his arm, conscious of possessing more than all the glory of the world, uttered the noble words, "Yes, I pray God that sooner or later, he may make not only thee, O king, but all who hear me to-day, what I now am, except these bonds!"

As the king and the procurator after this examination could not find Paul guilty of any offence punishable by the laws, the procurator would probably have set him at liberty, if after his appeal to Cæsar it had not been necessary for the matter to take its legal course; yet the report (*elogium*) with which he would be sent to Rome, could not be otherwise than in his favor. The centurion to whom he was committed, with other prisoners that were to be taken to Rome, certainly corroborated the impression of this favorable report by the account he gave of Paul's conduct during his long and dangerous voyage. Hence he met at Rome with more indulgent treatment than the other prisoners: he was allowed to hire a private dwelling in which only one soldier attended him as a guard, to whom he was fastened by a chain on the arm (the usual mode of the *custodia militaris*), and could without restraint receive visits, and write letters.

* I understand the words *ἐν ὀλίγῳ* (Acts xxvi. 28) in the only sense which they can have according to the *usus loquendi* and Paul's answer. The interpretation adopted by Meyer "with little," is indeed possible, but appears to me not so natural. If the reading of the Cod. Alex. and of the Vulgate, which Lachmann approves, *ἐν μεγάλῳ*, be adopted in Paul's answer, the words of Agrippa must be thus explained: With few reasons (which will not cost you much trouble) you think of making me a Christian,—and the answer of Paul will be: Whether with great or with little—for many or few reasons, I pray God, &c. But I cannot make up my mind to receive as correct this reading, which may be explained as a gloss, and is not supported by very preponderating authorities.

As he had cause to fear that the Jews dwelling at Rome had received from Jerusalem a report inimical to his character, and regarded him as an accuser of his people, he endeavored speedily to remove this unfavorable impression. Accordingly, three days after his arrival, he invited the principal persons among them to visit him. It proved that no report to Paul's prejudice had yet reached them, if it be allowed that they spoke the truth. It also appeared from the statements of these respectable Jews, that they had heard little or nothing of the Christian church which existed in the same city with themselves. Nor is this inconceivable, if we only consider the immense size of the metropolis, and the vast confluence of human beings it contained, and if to this we add, that the main body of that church consisted of Gentiles, and that these wealthy Jews busied themselves far more about other objects than about the concerns of religion. Yet it by no means appears from the statements of the Jews that they had scarcely heard of a Christian church existing at Rome, but only that they had not taken any pains to acquire an accurate knowledge of its existence. They knew indeed that this new sect met everywhere with opponents, and hence it might be inferred that they had heard of the controversies which had been carried on at Rome about it, for the "everywhere" (πανταχοῦ), in Acts xxviii. 22, certainly does not exclude a reference to what was going on at Rome itself, and we must not forget that only the substance of what the Jews said is handed down to us.* As they heard much of the opposition excited against this new sect, but nothing precise respecting its doctrines, they were well pleased that Paul proposed to give them an address on the subject. But here, as everywhere else, Paul's preaching found more acceptance with the Gentiles than with the Jews.†

* I cannot find any foundation for the contradiction which Dr. Baur thinks he has detected between this narration in the Acts, and the existence of such a church at Rome as the Epistle to the Romans requires us to suppose.

† The position developed and advocated with equal acuteness and learning by H. Böttger in the second part of his *Beiträge zur historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die paulinischen Briefe*, Göttingen, 1837,—that Paul was a prisoner only for the first three or five days after his arrival in Rome, that he then obtained his freedom, and lived for two years in a hired house, quite at liberty;—this position, if it were true, would cast a new light on Paul's history during this period; for it would then appear that all those Epistles, which evidently were written during some one imprisonment, could not have been written at Rome or during his first confinement there. But the narrative in the Acts is directly opposed to this supposition. I cannot understand Acts xxviii. 16, otherwise than that permission was then granted to Paul to reside in a private house, the same which is designated in v. 23, "his lodging," ξενία, and in v. 30, as "his own hired house," ἐν ἰδίῳ μισθώματι. It cannot be imagined, that if, after three days, so important an alteration had taken place in Paul's circumstances, Luke would not have mentioned it, for the assertion that his readers must have concluded this of themselves, from the known forms of Roman justice, cannot satisfy us. Even if this could have been supposed, he would hardly have omitted to point out in few words so important a change in Paul's lot. But it is not easily proved that such an inference could be drawn from what is known respecting the course of Roman justice at that time. The manner also in which Luke expresses him-

With the confinement of Paul at Rome, a new and important era commenced, not only in his life and ministry, but also in the development of the churches founded by him; for in proportion as Christianity spread more widely, a number of heterogeneous mental elements were brought into action, many important phenomena became conspicuous; while the divine word operated among them in an independent manner, and they were deprived of the apostle's personal oversight and guidance.

self (Acts xxviii. 30, 31) respecting Paul's residence for two years at Rome, certainly implies that he had not then obtained his freedom, for we are merely told that he preached the gospel in his own dwelling; but it is not narrated that he visited the synagogue or any place where the church met, for which omission no other reason can be given, than that, although he could receive any visit in his own residence, under the inspection of his guard, he was not at liberty to go to whatever place he chose; and least of all, would a prisoner, whose cause was not yet decided, have been permitted to attend these meetings of the church, even if accompanied by his guard. Here, therefore, we have a fact which cannot be explained, unless we admit the continued confinement of Paul. How likewise can it be imagined, that Paul, who wished to visit the church at Rome only on his way, would have stayed there for two years, where suitable measures had already been taken for the continued propagation of Christianity, instead of travelling to those regions of the West, where nothing at all had yet been done for making known the gospel? This is explicable only on the supposition, that he remained so long a time at Rome *under constraint*.

According to the account in the Acts, we may receive it as an established fact, that Paul lived two years in Rome as a prisoner,—a fact which can be overturned by nothing that we know of the course of Roman justice in the case of such appeals; even without waiting to examine how these could be reconciled to one another.

Meanwhile, from what is known of the legal processes in the time of the first Cæsars, it can by no means be proved, what is in the highest degree improbable, that all the causes which, in consequence of an appeal, were brought to Rome for decision, were decided in the course of five or ten days. It was one thing to decide on the admissibility of the appeal, and another thing to decide on the point of law respecting which the appeal was made. My respected colleague, Professor Rudorff, who has had the goodness to make me a written communication on this subject, concludes with the statement, that the term of five or ten days related not to the duration of the judicial proceedings, but to the lodging of the appeal, and to the *apostoli* (= *literæ dimissoriæ*); that it gave no prescription relative to the term of the transaction itself; and that the accused remained under arrest till the decision of the emperor. Thus, in the *Sententiæ Receptæ* of Julius Paulus, lib. v. tit. 34, it is said expressly of the *apostoli*, "Quorum postulatio et acceptio intra quintum diem ex officio facienda est," (whose application and grant must be made within five days). In a law enacted by the Emperor Constantine in 314, according to which, however, we are not justified in determining the legal process in the times of the first Cæsars, is the express provision that the *appellator* should be free from arrest only in *causæ civiles*, but of *criminales causæ* it is said, "In quibus, etiamsi possunt provocare, eum tamen statum debent obtinere, ut post provocationem in custodia perseverent," (in which although they can appeal, yet they ought to hold that position that, after the appeal, they may remain in custody.) Cod. Theodos. lib. xi. tit. 30, c. 2.

CHAPTER IX.

PAUL DURING HIS FIRST CONFINEMENT AT ROME, AND THE DEVELOPMENT DURING THE SAME PERIOD OF THE CHURCHES PREVIOUSLY FOUNDED BY HIM.

IN examining this portion of Paul's history, we must fix our attention on three principal points; his relation to the Roman state,—to the Church at Rome,—and to the Churches in other parts.

With respect to the first, the main thing to be considered is, from what point of view the charge under which he was detained as a prisoner is to be regarded? Christianity was not yet denounced as a *religio illicita*, therefore Paul could not, like the later teachers of Christianity, be accused of violating the laws of the state, on account of his exertions in propagating this religion. If Christians appeared only as a sect proceeding from Judaism, who were accused by Paul's Jewish adversaries of adulterating the original doctrines of their religion, then at Rome no attention would have been paid to disputes that merely concerned the religious institutions of the Jews. This charge against Paul could therefore have been considered as altogether foreign to Roman judicature, and he should have soon regained his liberty; in this manner the affair would soon have been brought to a close. But it cannot be shown that the matter should be viewed under this aspect, the most favorable for the apostle. The Jews might accuse him as being a disturber of the public peace, who interfered with the privileges guaranteed to them by the Roman government, as their advocate Tertullus had already attempted to prove. An additional allegation might be made, which in view of the Roman law would tend much more to Paul's injury—that he had caused among other Roman subjects and citizens in the provinces, and in Rome itself, movements which were detrimental to the good order of the state; that he had induced subjects and citizens to apostatize from the state religion, by propagating a religion at variance with the ancient Roman institutions, in which religion and politics were intimately blended.* If the church at Rome, consisting mainly of Gentile Christians, gave the impression, in its whole appearance, of being un-Jewish, in

* The point of view as a Roman statesman, from which Cicero formed his model of law. "Separatim nemo habessit Deos; neve novos sive advenas, nisi publice adscitos privatim colunto. *Ritus familiæ patrumque servant.*" (No one may have gods by himself; let no one worship new gods or foreign ones in private, unless recognised by the state. Let him preserve the rites of the family and of the fathers.) *Cicero de Legibus*, l. ii. 8; and in the *Commentaries*, c. x., against the *confusio religionum*, which arose from the introduction of foreign, new religions. This was the point of view from which Tacitus and the Younger Pliny formed their judgment of Christianity.

short, a *genus tertium*; this view of Paul's conduct would be formed so much the more easily. The existence of this new religious sect in the capital, would first be made an object of public attention by the proceedings against Paul. We may suppose, that his fanatical and artful adversaries among the Jews would leave no artifice untried to set his conduct in the worst possible light to the Roman authorities. Thus the investigation of his cause, with the accusation and defence, might be protracted, and his prospects might by turns become favorable or unfavorable.

During the *first* period of his residence at Rome he underwent no public examination.* His situation justified the most favorable expectations, and he proposed when set at liberty, before he extended his sphere of labor towards the West according to the plan he had previously formed to visit Lesser Asia, where his personal exertions seemed to be very necessary to counteract many influences that were operating injuriously on the churches. He could even intimate to an overseer of the church at Colossæ, Philemon, that he intended to take up his abode with him.

At a later period† of his imprisonment, when he had already undergone a public examination, he had no such favorable prospect before him; the thought of martyrdom became familiar to his mind; yet the expectation of being released from confinement was predominant, so that he wrote to the church at Philippi that he hoped to come to them soon. But if the view we have taken of the origin and original constitution of the church at Rome be correct, a close connexion and intimate communion may be presumed to have existed between its members and the individual whom they might regard mediately as their spiritual father, and whose peculiar form of doctrine prevailed among them. Now if the epistles which Paul wrote during his first confinement at Rome bore evidence against such a supposition, they might also be adduced against our views.‡ If these epistles make us acquainted with any difference existing between the Roman church and Paul, this fact would be very decisive, and we should be forced to conclude that a strongly marked Judaizing element predominated in that church. But the Roman Christians had already, even before he arrived at Rome, evinced their sympathy, since several of their number travelled a day's journey, as far as the small town of *Forum Appii*, and some a shorter distance to the place called *Tres Tabernæ*, in order to meet him. In the Epistle to the Philippians he sends salutation from the *whole* church (πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι) which is a proof of the close connexion in which he stood with them.

* Whether this term embraced the whole of the first two years of his confinement we cannot with certainty determine, for the silence of Luke in the Acts, which he closes so abruptly, is not a sufficient proof that, during the whole of this period, there was nothing memorable to be narrated respecting the fate of the imprisoned apostle.

† As appears from his Epistle to the Philippians.

‡ As has actually been done by Schneckenburger, in the work to which we have frequently referred, see p. 123.

As to his giving special salutations from the Christians in the service of the imperial palace (the *Cæsariani*), we are not to infer that these persons were more in unison with him than the rest of the church, but rather that they were better acquainted, and on more intimate terms, with the church at Philippi. At all events, it is an arbitrary supposition* that these Gentile Christians were those who, in distinction from the rest of the church consisting of Jewish Christians, were in closer connexion with Paul. It might indeed be expected, that if these *Cæsariani* were more allied by their Gentile origin to the church at Philippi, he would have mentioned this circumstance as the reason for presenting their special salutations. It is not at all inconsistent with this view, if these epistles contain undeniable marks, that in the Roman church Judaizers were found hostile to Paul, and occasioning him much vexation; for we ourselves have pointed out a Judaizing tendency in a smaller part of this church sufficient to account for such an appearance. As the Gentile Christians who advocated the Pauline principles, now found so important a support in his personal presence, and coöperated with him in publishing the gospel among the Gentiles, the opposition of the Judaizing anti-Pauline party must have been excited by it, and rendered still more active and violent. The whole tone of the Epistle to the Philippians† testifies of the conflicts he sustained in his intercourse with the Judaizers. His excited feelings cannot be mistaken; his displeasure was called forth by anxiety for the purity of the gospel against those who, where the soul appeared in a fit state for receiving the gospel, sought to take advantage of it in every way, for gaining adherents for their Jewish ceremonies and doctrine of meritorious works, at the same time that they won them to a reception of Christianity. And Paul himself distinguishes those among the Roman Christians who, with friendly feelings towards himself, were active in coöperating with him for the spread of the gospel, from those who, animated with jealousy at his success, endeavored to form a party against him, and to "add affliction to his bonds," Phil. i. 15-18; and among the whole body of Jewish Christians about him, he could only point out two who labored with him for the kingdom of God, and contributed to his comfort; Col. iv. 11.

During his confinement, anxiety for the extension of the kingdom of God, and for the prosperity of the churches he had founded, occupied him far more than the care of his personal welfare. As all persons had free access to him, he thus enjoyed opportunities for preaching the gospel. By the soldiers who relieved one another in standing guard over him, it became known among their comrades, (among the *cohortes prætorianæ*, in the *castra prætoria*, in the *prætorium*) and hence to a wider extent in the city, that he was put in confinement, not on account of any civil offence, but for his zeal on behalf of the new religion; and

* Proposed by Schneckenburger, p. 123.

† As Schneckenburger remarks with great justice, p. 123.

this tended to promote it, since a cause for which its advocate sacrificed everything was certain of attracting attention. By his example, also, many of the Roman Christians were roused to publish the truth zealously and boldly. But while some coöperated with Paul in a oneness of heart and mind, others came forward who belonged to the anti-Pauline Judaizing party, in opposition to his method of publishing the gospel. The manner in which he expresses himself respecting these his opponents is worthy of notice on two accounts. We here see a man who could entirely forget his own person when the cause of his Lord was concerned, —who could even rejoice in what bore an unfriendly aspect towards himself, if it contributed to promote the cause of Christ. We perceive how far his zeal for the truth and against error was from all selfish contractedness; with what freedom of spirit he was able to pass judgment on all doctrinal differences. Even in the erroneous views of these Judaizers he acknowledged the truth that lay at their basis; and when he compared the errors propagated by them, with the fundamental truth which they announced at the same time, it was still a cause of joy to him that this fundamental truth was becoming more generally known, that in every way, whether in pretence (by those who in their hearts preferred Judaism to Christianity,) or with an upright intention, Christ was preached, Phil. i. 18. For even by these persons the knowledge of the facts on which the gospel rested was spread to a greater extent; and where faith in Jesus as the Messiah, the Founder and King of the kingdom of God, was once produced, on this foundation a superstructure could be raised of more correct and extended instruction. But from this we learn what is of service for explaining later appearances in the history of the Roman church, that when the Pauline spirit was communicated to it, there was at the same time transplanted within it the germ of a Judaizing tendency.

The concerns of the churches of Lesser Asia first occupied Paul's attention in his imprisonment.* He had received an exact account of

* The supposition on which we here proceed, that Paul wrote the Epistles to the Colossians, the Ephesians, and Philemon, during this confinement at Rome, has found in later times strenuous opponents in Schulz and Schott, to whom must be added Böttger; but the arguments advanced by them against it do not appear to me adapted to overthrow the opinion hitherto most generally held, though no demonstrative proof can be given in its favor, since Paul does not exactly state the circumstances under which he wrote. What he says of the opportunities presented for announcing the gospel, at least agrees best with what we know of his confinement at Rome from the hints given at the close of the Acts and in the Epistle to the Philippians. (The latter indeed cannot be urged against Böttger, for he supposes that epistle to have been written while Paul was confined at Cæsarea.) It does not appear to me surprising, that a runaway slave from Colossæ should betake himself at once to Rome; for the constant intercourse with the capital of the empire would easily furnish him with an opportunity, and he might hope for greater security from the distance and the immense population of the metropolis. Nor is it at all strange, that a teacher of the church at Colossæ should be induced, by the dangers that threatened pure Christianity there, to travel as far as Rome in order to consult the apostle and to solicit his assistance;

their condition from an eminent individual belonging to the church of Colossæ, Epaphras, the founder of that and of the neighboring Christian communities. He visited Paul at Rome, and gave practical proofs of his sympathy,* and through him the apostle learnt how very many things, which had happened in the churches of Lesser Asia during his absence, required to be vigorously counteracted.

During the preceding year, a new influence emanating from Judaism had been developed in those regions;—an influence with which Christianity had hitherto not come in contact, but which now threatened to mingle with it, and to endanger its purity and simplicity. It might be expected that Christianity on its first spread among the Jews, would chiefly come in contact with the Pharisaic mode of thinking which was then predominant. Hence the first false teachers, with whom Paul had hitherto been so often in conflict, had originated in a mingling of Pharisaic Judaism with Christianity. But now, after Christianity had spread further among the Jews, and had attracted the attention of those who lived in greater retirement, and troubled themselves little about the novelties of the day, its influence affected sects that had long existed among the Jews of a theosophic-ascetic character, such as that of the Essenes.† Persons of such a tendency must have felt themselves at-

though we cannot determine with certainty whether other personal concerns did not also bring Epaphras to Rome. Neither can the fact that Paul, when at Rome, desired a lodging to be in readiness for him at Colossæ, determine anything; for though he had at an earlier period formed the intention to travel first into Spain, yet, as we have already remarked, he might be induced, by the information respecting the changes in the churches of Lesser Asia, to alter his plan. Nor is it otherwise than natural, that, during his confinement at Rome, he should collect around him younger men, who at other times had been used to serve as companions and instruments in his ministry, and that he should now make use of them in order to maintain with the distant churches, of whose situation he could receive information through various channels at Rome, a living connexion adapted to their necessities.

* It is remarkable that Paul, in the Epistle to Philemon, calls this Epaphras his "*fellow-prisoner in Christ Jesus*." As he thus distinguishes him from his other fellow-laborers, we may conclude that it could be affirmed only of Epaphras. Since the judicial inquiry instituted against Paul would have attracted the attention of the Roman magistrates to the new religious party that were opposed to the religion of the state, it may be supposed that this led to the apprehension of Epaphras, who had labored so zealously on behalf of this cause in Lesser Asia. But it is against this opinion, that he is not mentioned with this epithet in the Epistle to the Colossians, unless we suppose that the apprehension of Epaphras did not occur till after that epistle was written. Still it is fair to suppose, that he was distinguished by this epithet to Philemon only as a faithful companion of the apostle in his confinement; as on the other hand he is distinguished by *another* epithet in the epistle to the whole church at Colossæ; and *this* title of honor (ὁ συναίχμαλωτός μου) is applied, in the same epistle, to Aristarchus, who had accompanied the apostle in his confinement.

† Storr's opinion that the Jewish-Christian sect at Colossæ was derived immediately from the Essenes, who yet can be regarded only as one manifestation of this general mental tendency, is not supported by sufficient evidence. Yet it is not a decisive objection against it, that the Essenes had not spread themselves beyond Palestine, and showed no inclination for proselytism; for by the influence of Christianity, it is very possible that the

tracted, still more than Jews of the common Pharisaical bias, by what Christianity presented that was suited to the internal religious sentiment; only they were too much entangled in their mystical-ascetic bias, so opposite to the free, practical spirit of the gospel, and in their spiritual pride, to be able to appropriate the gospel simply and purely with a renunciation of the preëminence of a higher religious philosophy, which they fancied themselves to possess, and of a higher practical perfection in their modes of abstinence. They must have been rather tempted to remodel Christianity according to their former ideas and tendencies, and to recast it into a theosophic form of their own. We here see a tendency, first germinating in the circle of Judaism, from which, in the following century, manifold branches proceeded of a Gnosticism that was hostile to the simple gospel.* Paul had probably cause, from his experience during his long sojourn in Lesser Asia, to apprehend the springing up of a tendency so injurious to the gospel, and hence we may account for his warnings addressed to the presbyters of the Ephesian church. His apprehensions were now verified. Jewish false teachers of this tendency had made their way into the church at Colossæ. What distinguished them from the common pharisaically-minded Jewish Christians was this,—that they did not begin with recommending to the Gentiles the observance of Jewish ceremonies, as indispensable for justification and sanctification, and for obtaining eternal happiness. Had they proceeded in this manner, they would in all probability not have found

original character of such a sect might be somewhat modified. And I would by no means adduce against it, what is said in the Epistle to the Colossians, not merely of the practically ascetic, but also of the theosophic tendency of this sect (their *φιλοσοφία*), since we cannot trust what Philo says of the Essenes as the ideal of practical philosophers. See my Church History, vol. i. p. 47. But although in this epistle some marks may be found which suit the Essenes, as, for instance, what is said of abstinence, of chastising the body, of the observance of the ceremonial law, of the reverence paid to angels, &c.; yet all this is too general not to suit many other similar manifestations, arising from the same mental tendency; and on the other hand, we find nothing which marks the whole peculiar character of the Essenes. As a proof how much a propensity to busy themselves with angelology was spread among the Jews, we may notice the words in the *κήρυγμα Πέτρου*, in which it is said: *μηδὲ κατὰ Ἰουδαίους σέβεσθε, καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι οἰόμενοι τὸν θεὸν γινώσκειν, οὐκ ἐπίστανται, λατρεύοντες ἀγγέλοις καὶ ἀρχαγγέλοις.* (Nor worship according to the Jews, for truly they, thinking that they know God, do not understand, being subject to angels and archangels.) See Clement. *Stromata*, vi. 635, Grabe. *Spicileg.* i. 64. If also an intention was contained in these words to indicate a subordinate place to Judaism, as a religious system communicated by angels (the idea which at a later period was improved upon by the Gnostics), the doctrine in vogue among the Jews concerning angels, and their connexion with them, might serve as a point of connexion for this censure.

* Baur and Schweigler are disposed to find in these appearances the marks of a post-apostolic age, and make use of the smaller Paulinian epistles, in order to support the fabrication of a peculiar post-apostolic literature: we maintain, on the contrary, that exactly such mixtures of the religious spirit as we here find, serve to elucidate the transition from the Pauline to the succeeding age. The course of historical development would allow us to assume such links, even if unquestionable records had not borne evidence of their existence.

an entrance so easily into churches consisting purely of Gentile Christians. But they boasted of the knowledge of a higher wisdom transmitted by tradition among the consecrated,* a higher knowledge of the spiritual world, with which they pretended to stand in a closer connexion, a connexion which they could procure for those who were disposed to be initiated into their mysteries. With this theoretical tendency they joined a strict asceticism in practice, which was probably in close connexion with their theosophic principles, and had its foundation in their notions of matter, as the source and principle of evil; and thus also many particulars in their rules for abstaining from certain things, which it would be injurious to touch or taste, may be referred not simply to the Jewish laws respecting food, but to their peculiar theoretic doctrines.

The history of religion acquaints us with a twofold tendency of mysticism; one that adheres to the prevailing cultus, and professes to disclose its higher meaning: another that wears a hostile aspect towards it, and entirely despises what in it is external and historical. This contrariety had already made its appearance in the Jewish philosophical religion at Alexandria. Among the Jews in that place, a class of religious Idealists had been formed, who, viewing the historical and the literal in religion only as the covering or vehicle of general ideas, drew the inference that the attainment of perfection depended on holding fast those ideas, while all besides was abandoned to the childish multitude, who were incapable of higher conceptions, and satisfied with the outward husk of sensible objects.† Philo, in whom we have an example of the first tendency, combats, although agreeing with them in the principles of allegorical interpretations, those despisers of the letter; while he taught that it was possible only by spiritual intuition to penetrate into the true internal meaning of religion, and to know those mysteries of which outward Judaism presented the symbols. But he also taught, that in proportion to the conscientious reverence with which the external was contemplated, would be the progress, through divine illumination, in the examination of the internal.‡ This last tendency we must suppose to exist in the sect of which we are now speaking.

In however slight a degree a party of common Judaizers would have been dangerous to the church at Colossæ, yet Judaism under this modi-

* Perhaps they themselves used the term *φιλοσοφία*, since this appellation, in consequence of the mixture of Oriental and Grecian ideas at this time, might have been used, as well as the word *γνώσις* afterwards employed among the Jewish theosophic sects to designate their pretended mysteries.

† Thus characterized by Philo: *οἱ τοὺς ῥητοὺς νόμους σύμβολα νοητῶν πραγμάτων ἐπολαμβάνοντες, τὰ μὲν ἄγαν ἠκρίβωσαν, τῶν δὲ βαθύμων ὀλιγώρησαν*, (those who regard written laws as the symbols of things that lie within the province of the understanding, have examined some things very accurately, but have neglected other things with easy indifference.) See his work, *De Migratione Abrahami*, p. 16.

‡ Philo's words are: *Φυλαττομένων τούτων (the external, the letter,) ἀριδιώτερον καὶ ἐκείνα γνωρισθήσεται*.

fication would be far more dangerous for many. For the people of that age who were filled with anxiety for a communication with heaven, and for the investigation of the invisible stretching beyond the limits of earthly existence, the promise of a higher knowledge that to a certain extent would release them from the thraldom of the senses, was very seducing. The seeking for this knowledge had led many to Christianity, which, while it brought them to a consciousness of the real wants of their religious and moral nature, for which it guaranteed the relief, communicated on the other hand another tendency to their minds; but before it had thoroughly penetrated their life and thoughts, it might easily happen that such illusions, falling in with a previous and only partially conquered tendency, would deceive them by the dazzling appearance of something higher than what was offered them in the simple and ever practical doctrine of the apostles. Moreover, in a country like Phrygia, where a propensity for the mystical and magical was always rife, as was evident from the forms of religion peculiar to the country—the worship of Cybele, and afterwards Montanism—* such a tendency would be specially dangerous to Christianity.

Paul describes the higher philosophy of religion of which these people boasted, as the following of human traditions,† as a cleaving to the elements‡ of the world, and as not proceeding from Christ. He objects to the preachers of this doctrine, that they did not adhere to Christ as the head. From this it has been incorrectly inferred by many, that these persons were in no sense Christians. But the main point in Paul's disapproval of them is this, that their doctrine, although connected with Christianity, was in contradiction to its spirit and nature,—that although they acknowledged Jesus as the Christ, and therefore as their Lord and Head, yet the spirit and tendency of their doctrine were at variance with this acknowledgement, since they did not everywhere in accordance with

* Compare Böhmer's *Isagoge in Epistolam ad Coloss.*, p. 9.

† Not proceeding from what the Spirit of God had revealed.

‡ The "elements of the world," *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*, in Col. ii. 8, and other passages, are not necessarily to be understood, it appears to me, as is commonly explained, of the *rudimenta religionis*, as well of Judaism as of Heathenism. I must regard this explanation as purely arbitrary, since there is nothing in connection with the word *στοιχεῖα* which can point to *this* figurative use of it; and nothing by which to indicate the special sphere to which the rudiments here spoken of belong. The passage in Heb. v. 12, is on a wholly different subject, and should not therefore be here taken into account. A comparison of all the Pauline passages, and the Pauline association of ideas, seems to me to favor our understanding the phrase of the elements of the world in a peculiar sense, as denoting the earthly, elsewhere termed "the carnal," *τὰ σαρκικά*. Hence ii. 20, *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου* and *κόσμος* may be considered as synonymous.

This is an important conception in the Pauline doctrine, and we shall treat more at length of it in the Section devoted specially to doctrines. It is plain, however, that the harmony between this epistle and the Epistle to the Galatians,—such harmony as could come, not from an imitator, but only from the author himself,—belongs among the marks of the undeniably genuine Pauline character of this epistle.

it, set out from their relation to him in their striving after a knowledge of divine things, and make him their central point. In fact, it is only on the supposition that they professed to attach themselves to the Christian faith, that this disapproval retains its full significance.

It would indeed be possible so to explain the relation of these persons to Christianity,* that they did not come forward in direct hostility against it, but yet ascribed to it only a subordinate importance in their religious development—that they acknowledged Christ only as the prophet of the heathen world, which hitherto had known nothing of the true God, and attributed to the religion revealed by him only a subordinate value for the religious culture of the heathen.† They perhaps taught that by their connexion with the hidden supreme God which was effected through Judaism, they were raised above the revelations of the Mediator, the Logos, and thus above Christianity, and thereby obtained the power to employ higher spirits themselves in their service.‡ According to this view, we may

* This view has been recently developed with much skill and in an acute and spirited manner by Dr. Schneckenburger, in his work on the Baptism of Proselytes. It has been developed anew by him in his *Beiträge zur Einleitung in's neue Testament*, p. 146.

† Among the Jewish theologians, there were those who had borrowed from the Platonic philosophy the doctrine of the constellations, regarding these as in a certain sense *θεοὶ αἰσθητοί*; and who accordingly explained the passage in Deut. iv. 19, as meaning that God had left the adoration of the heavenly bodies to other nations, as occupying a subordinate religious position, but had revealed *himself* only to the Jews. This view might afterwards be further modified, that God had given the Logos or Jesus to the heathen as their teacher and governor, but that the knowledge and worship of the Supreme God was only to be found among the Jews. Since Justin Martyr, in his Dialogue with Trypho, has put into Trypho's mouth what the Jewish theologians of that time were in the habit of saying, we may consider him as expressing their views, when Justin makes him to say; *ἔστω ὑμῶν ἐξ ἔθνων κύριος καὶ θεὸς γνωριζόμενος, ὡς αἱ γραφαὶ σημαίνουν, οἵτινες καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ Χριστιανοὶ καλεῖσθαι πάντες ἐσχήκατε· ἡμεῖς δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ αὐτὸν τοῦτον ποιήσαντος λατρεῦντες ὄντες, οὐ δεόμεθα τῆς ὁμολογίας αὐτοῦ, οὐδὲ τῆς προσκυνήσεως.* (Ye who are of the Gentiles, let your Lord and God be made known, as the Scriptures declare, who also, from the name of your God, have all been called Christians; but we, who are worshippers of the God that made yours, need not confess yours, nor worship him.) The doctrine of the Clementines also may be here compared. According to this work, Christianity contained in a form of revelation designed for heathens, the same as original Judaism purified from foreign admixtures, so that he who adhered to Jesus alone, as well as he who adhered to Moses alone, could attain to a participation of the kingdom of God, provided the latter did not transgress by blaspheming Christ, and the former by blaspheming Moses. If a Jew, with a greater partiality for Judaism, contemplated Christianity, yet the same fundamental principle could easily be so modified, that genuine Judaism, apprehended in the spirit of it, would appear more valuable than that form of revelation which was specially intended for the Gentiles.

‡ The idea was certainly to be found among the Gnostics of the second century, and meets us in the Indian religious systems, and in Buddhism, that men, by communion with the Supreme original being, obtained power to make use of inferior spirits for their own ends, and that in this manner wonderful things could be accomplished by their aid. Here the contrast which Philo makes between the *υἱοὶ τοῦ λόγου* and the *υἱοὶ τοῦ ὄντος* may be applied, only in a somewhat modified form; for the Alexandrian theologians of Philo's school attached no importance to the connexion with angels, since they comprised

suppose that these persons, with their pretended spiritual conception of Judaism, had formed the same judgment respecting the subordinate conceptions of Christianity, as many of the later Gnostics with their spiritualised Christianity were accustomed to pass on Judaism as the religion of the Demiurgus.

But although such a conception of the peculiarities of this sect is possible, yet it is by no means sufficiently supported by the marks derived from Paul's argumentation. Had they sought actually to seduce from Christianity those among whom they found entrance, Paul would certainly have marked this more strongly. His reasonings indeed, as they are carried on in this epistle, would apply to those persons who, though engaged in no immediate and open opposition to Christianity, yet assigned to it a very subordinate place;* but the peculiar manner in which he combats them by no means justifies us in concluding that this special view of theirs was the direct object of his censure. Since he reproves these persons for their reverence of angels, it follows that they placed themselves in a subordinate relation to angels, and hence certainly to the Logos, a being exalted above all angels (the ἀρχάγγελος). Had they maintained that by an immediate connexion with the hidden God, they could exalt themselves above the Logos and his revelation, Paul would without doubt have expressed, in direct opposition to this doctrine, the fundamental principle, that men can enter into connexion with the Father only through the Logos. He makes use, it is true, of this principle, but in reference to a different controversy.

In that Judaizing sect which here came into conflict with the simple apostolic doctrine, we see the germ of the Judaizing Gnosticism. Though the account given by Epiphanius of the conflict between Cerinthus and the apostle Paul is not worthy of credit, yet at least between the tendency which Paul here combats and the tendency of Cerinthus the greatest agreement is found to exist, and, judging by internal marks, we may consider the sect here spoken of to be allied to the Cerinthian. It is remarkable that, to a late period, traces of such a Judaizing, angelological tendency were to be found in those parts, for at the council of Laodicea canons were framed against a Judaizing observance of the Sabbath, and a species of angelolatry,†

everything in the contact of the spirit with God himself, and the contemplation of ideas. In the sect here spoken of, the oriental-theosophic rather than the Grecian-philosophic element of Philo's theology is prominent.

* Schneckenburger has specially developed this view in his late essay on this subject.

† Can. xx. *ὅτι οὐ δεῖ Χριστιανοῖς ἰουδαΐζειν καὶ ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ σχολάζειν.* (That it is not necessary that Christians should Judaize, and have nothing to do on the Sabbath.) Can. xvi. ordains: *ἐν σαββάτῳ εὐαγγέλια μετὰ ἐτέρων γραφῶν* (the Old Testament) *ἀναγιγνώσκεισθαι.* (On the Sabbath the Gospels, with other Scriptures, are to be read.) Can. xxxv. *ὅτι οὐ δεῖ Χριστιανοὺς ἐγκαταλείπειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀγγέλους ὀνομάζειν καὶ συνάξεις.*—(That it is not necessary that Christians should forsake the church of God and address angels, and that meetings)—for paying reverence to angels.—The following canon is also worthy of notice, as indicating the predominant and peculiar

and even in the ninth century we find a kindred sect, the Athin-ganians.*

In the example of Paul we recognise the peculiar character of the apostolic mode of refuting error, and how it differs from that of later times. While this busies itself with the confutation of particular errors, Paul, on the contrary, seized the real root of the doctrine in its peculiar religious fundamental tendency from which all the particular errors proceeded, and opposed to it the spirit of the gospel. His method was rather positive than negative. Thus he repressed the boasting of a pretended superior wisdom and of a delusive acquaintance with spirits, without setting himself to oppose each separate particular, by exhibiting a truth that marks the central point of Christianity; that by communion with Christ alone we receive all the fulness of the divine life;† by him alone we are incorporated into the kingdom of God, and we belong to that same kingdom to which all higher spirits belong, by union with him as the common head of the whole; in him we have all things which are needed for the development of the internal life, and hence we need no other Mediator. For the purpose of combating a painful superstition, which represented this and the other object as polluting and hurtful, and recommended various preservatives for warding off the influence of evil

mental tendency: *ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἱερατικοὺς ἢ κληρικοὺς μάγους ἢ ἐπαιδοὺς εἶναι ἢ μαθηματικούς ἢ ἀστρολόγους ἢ ποιεῖν τὰ λεγόμενα φυλακτήρια.* (That it is not necessary that priests or the clergy should be wise men, or poets, or mathematicians, or astrologers, or makers of the so-called amulets.) Theodoret says, in his commentary on this epistle (ii. 18), that this superstition for a long time maintained itself in Phrygia and Pisidia, and that in his day, oratories were to be found in this and the adjacent districts dedicated to the Archangel Michael.

* See my Church History, vol. iii. p. 592.

† The arbitrary manner in which Baur and Schwegler attempt to prove the Gnostic element in this epistle, and in the Epistles to the Ephesians and Philippians, requires no refutation. No one who is not held by a fixed delusion, can think of finding in the use of the word "fulness," *πλήρωμα*, in the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians, a reference to the gnostic doctrine of a Pleroma. The use of this word in these epistles is most naturally accounted for, from the peculiar Pauline circle of ideas, of which the germ lies at the basis of the other Pauline epistles, but here appears more fully expanded, as belonging to this stage of his doctrinal development, and required by the subject in hand. We shall have more to say respecting it in the second section relating to doctrine, and shall then enter more fully into the refutation of the asserted difference of doctrine between this and the earlier epistles of Paul. How far is the pure, practical spirit in the Epistle to the Colossians from everything Gnostic! Where, in the second century, could the mental tendency be found from which such an epistle could proceed? where the man who could write such an epistle? According to the whimsical notion of the newest of all criticism, the most powerful minds, who were capable of the greatest things, existed in that age, who yet found their satisfaction in living in profound obscurity. But as error and truth go together in the developing processes of history, and mutually check and modify one another, so the springing up of sects at the close of the Pauline age, and the later stage in the impress of the apostolic doctrine, constitute a middle link presupposed by the formation of the gnosis in the second century. The criticism which we combat, springs over this middle link by an unhistorical *hysteron-proteron*.

spirits,* he appealed to the facts of Christian consciousness; that Christians were redeemed from the power of evil, and, in communion with Christ, were certain of their triumph over all the powers of darkness—that as their inner life was exalted above the reach of earthly things, to which they were dead with Christ, that as it already belonged to heaven, with which they were incorporated through Christ, so it ought to be altogether carried out of the reach of a religion cleaving to the senses; nor ought Christians to allow this their life thus exalted to heaven and rooted in communion with God, to be dragged down to the elements of the world, to sensible earthly things.—“See to it,” said the apostle, “that no one robs you of your Christian freedom, that no one drags you along as his prey by the worthless deceitful semblance of a pretended higher wisdom which follows human traditions, cleaves to the elements of the world, and proceeds not from Christ. Everything which does not proceed from him is delusion; for the whole church of God, which belongs to him as his body, exists in dependence on him; and through him, who is the common head of all the powers of the spiritual world, are ye, who before were as Gentiles excluded from the development of God’s kingdom, now incorporated with it. He has obtained for you the forgiveness of sins, and thus has also freed you from the law which testified against you as an indictment, having blotted it out. By his sufferings he has triumphed over the whole kingdom of evil, so that weakened as it is, you, as redeemed, no longer need to fear it. Since through Christ you have been made free from the guilt that oppressed you, from the yoke of the law and from the fear of the kingdom of evil, so let no one of you hazard becoming slaves again, and condemn yourselves on account of those outward things, all of which were only shadows of what was to come; but in Christ we behold the reality itself. May no one succeed in beguiling you in reference to your highest interests (merely because it so pleases him—for his own arbitrary pleasure) by the appearance of a humility put on for show, by the worship of angels, since he is disposed to pry into what is hidden from man†—for such a one, with all

* With the doctrine of various orders of angels, this sect certainly combined the doctrine of various orders of evil spirits. These evil spirits were considered as specially connected with matter (*πνεύματα ὑλικά*). By sensuality, and especially by the enjoyment of certain kinds of food, men were especially exposed to their influence; and by chastening the body, and abstaining from the indulgence of the senses, men were withdrawn from their influence.

† In the passage, Col. ii. 18, that reading which omits the *μή* has much in its favor, the authority of the more important manuscripts, and the comparison with the other reading, *οὐκ*, which may be considered as a similar gloss. It is also more easy to explain how the connexion of the whole verse might occasion the interpolation of the negative, than how it should occasion its rejection, by which it is only made more difficult. If this reading be adopted, we must understand the passage thus: “He pries into what (as he indeed imagines) he has seen, the appearances of angels—puffed up by the delusive images, which are only a reflection of the sensuality that prevails over him, of his sensual earthly tendency to which he drags down the objects of religion, the invisible.” And in this case the contrast would be very suitable; he adheres not in his faith to the invisible Head.

his appearance of humility and spiritual life, is puffed up with an ungodly mind, which places its confidence in a nullity; he can exalt himself neither above the world nor to Christ, for he does not hold fast the Head from which alone the body, animated by it and held together by its influence in all its members, can develop itself to the end designed by God. How is it, if ye are dead with Christ to the things of the world, that ye can adopt as if ye belonged to the world, such maxims as, Touch not this, taste not that; since all this, according to the doctrine of these persons, will only by the use tend to destruction! Which doctrines certainly have an appearance of wisdom in the arbitrarily invented worship of God, the show of humility, and the chastening of the body; but are yet purely things which have no significance, and only serve to gratify an ungodly mind. If, therefore, ye are risen with Christ, seek after that which is above: let your thoughts be directed thither where Christ is, who is exalted to the right hand of God: let your wishes be fixed only on heaven." This aim towards heaven, this life rooted in God, was always set in opposition by Paul to the superstition that would drag down divine knowledge to the objects of sense.

This epistle was conveyed to the church at Colossæ by Tychicus, one of the missionary assistants of Paul, who was returning to Lesser Asia, his native country. But since Paul could not furnish him with epistles for all the Asiatic churches, and yet would gladly have testified his lively interest in all, and wished, as the apostle of the Gentiles, to address a word to all collectively, he prepared a circular letter designed for all the churches in that region. In this epistle, in which the apostle of the Gentiles addressed himself to *all Gentile Christians* as such, he treats only of one great subject of general interest, the actual efficiency of the gospel among the Gentiles, without entering upon other topics.* The similarity of the two epistles (the Epistle to the Colossians and the so-called Epistle to the Ephesians) is of such a kind, that we see in it the work of the same author, and not an imitation by another hand.† If

But yet this reading appears to me to have the connexion and the meaning of single words too much against it for me to admit it. The "intruding into," *ἐμβαρύνειν*, appears to me too plainly to designate an impertinent eagerness to pry into what is hidden from human sight, and to presuppose the negative *μή*; and if the apostle had wished to mark supposed appearances of angels, he would certainly not have said "has seen," *έώρακεν*, without some further limitation, some additional phrase, with which the following "vainly," *εικᾷ*, might be connected; as, for example, by saying "thinks that he has seen," *έωρακέναί δοκεί*, this vision would have been marked as deceptive and presumptuous.

* It was so far a happy thought of Schulz, to describe this epistle as a companion to the Epistle to the Hebrews.

† I will here notice some of the doubts that have been raised in the most recent times against the genuineness of this Epistle to the Ephesians; those, I mean, which could strike so considerate a critic as De Wette, a man distinguished by so much love for truth, and so disposed to receive it. The collocation of apostles and prophets in ch. ii. 20; iii. 5; iv. 11, must be un-apostolical. It is true, such a phrase does not elsewhere occur in the Pauline epistles, but it is not on that account to be set down as something un-Pauline, or foreign to the Pauline age. In ch. iv. 11, the Apostles, so-called in a stricter sense, are brought

the relation of this circular letter to the Epistle to the Colossians, and if that by which in its form and contents as a circular letter it is distinguished from the other Pauline epistles could awaken doubts of its genuineness even with the more considerate critics, yet precisely those peculiarities which specially distinguish it, taken in connection with the common Pauline characteristics, furnish a proof of its genuineness. Who in the second century could have formed and executed the purpose to forge, after the Epistle to the Colossians, such an encyclical Epistle to all the Gentile Christians, in no part of which there could be found a morbid opposing tendency, except by the eye of an intoxicated criticism that can detect tendencies in the simplest things. Let us remember that Paul, when he wrote this epistle, was still full of those thoughts and contemplations which occupied his mind when he wrote the Epistle to the Colossians; thus we can account for those points of resemblance in the second, which was written immediately after the first. And hence it also is evident, that of these two, the Epistle to the Colossians was written first, for the apostle's thoughts there exhibit themselves in their original

forward, after them more are named who published the gospel in a wide circle, whose activity was not confined to one congregation—the common missionaries, the evangelists, corresponding to what the “teachers,” διδάσκαλοι, were for single congregations, and those in whom the creative element of immediate spiritual awakening predominated, who received, by special revelations, disclosures respecting Christian truth, (see p. 176) in whom the power of inspiration appeared especially in discourse, who as teachers stood nearest to the apostles in originality, the prophets. That there were such prophets, who as missionaries stood by the side of the apostles, is testified by the Acts, and apart from that, by the name of Barnabas, and by 1 Cor. xii. 28. A later writer would not have been induced to place together in this manner apostles and prophets; for this position of the prophets was foreign to a later period. Of the Montanist body of prophets, to whom Baur and Schwegler allude, there is no trace in this epistle; and indeed, generally, we should regard it as the most flagrant anachronism to pretend to find anything Montanistic in this epistle. In the manner of distinguishing between the “pastors,” ποιμένες and “teachers,” διδάσκαλοι, we also recognise something which belongs only to this age; (compare the distinction between διδάσκαλοι and κυβερνήσεις, 1 Cor. xii. 28; the distinction between διδάσκειν and προτετασθαι, Rom. xii. 7, 8.) But Baur thinks that he has discovered in the whole passage an idea foreign to Paul, of a progressive development of the church, the representation of an approaching more perfect age of ecclesiastical development, which certainly would not be in harmony with the expectation of the speedy second advent of Christ. But this passage contains nothing of the kind; Paul speaks only of the church of that age in which he wrote the epistle, and marks its development from its childhood (νηπιότης), to its maturity (τελειότης), a perfectly Pauline idea, which is found in the universally acknowledged genuine Pauline epistles. We are at a loss to conceive how any one could think of finding here the Montanist idea of successive stages in the growth of the church. De Wette maintains further, that the mention of the doctrine of Justification in ch. ii. 8–10, is hardly in accordance with the apostle's doctrinal theology. But this I cannot perceive. On the contrary, I recognize nothing but what is most truly Pauline. Although Paul is not writing to those in whom he would presuppose a disposition to confide in the merits of the “works of law,” not to those who were formerly Jews, yet he had reason to bring forward the universal and to him ever-present truth, that, in their being called to Christianity, all of them, without distinction, were indebted for everything to grace alone; the few who had hitherto led a more moral life, as well as the majority who had been sunk in vice. Compare 1 Cor. i. 29, 30. In that passage he was obliged thus to express himself on account of the contrast, since he

formation and connexion, as they were called forth by his opposition to that sect whose sentiments and practices he combats in that epistle.*

Though this epistle has come down to us in the manuscripts now extant, as addressed to the church at Ephesus, yet the general character of the contents, suited to the wants of the Asiatic Christians of Gentile descent, testifies, by the absence of all special references to the peculiar circumstances of the Ephesian church, against such an exclusive or predominant appropriation of it. If this epistle had been designed principally for the Ephesian church, Paul would certainly have been impelled to say to those among whom he had spent so long a time, many things relating solely to their peculiar circumstances. This conclusion, which we draw with certainty from the contents of the epistle, is confirmed by the information that has come down to us from antiquity, that the designation of

wished to lay a stress upon the point. The new creation, previous to which they could accomplish nothing good, and to which they owed everything, must necessarily manifest itself through genuine "good works," *εργα ἀγαθά*. In the next place, De Wette notices the arbitrary application in Eph. iv. 8 of Ps. lxxviii. 18. It is indeed a free application, but yet spirited and not forced. In that passage Jehovah is represented as a victorious leader, bringing his enemies in triumph to the heights of Zion, to whom his conquered foes do homage by the presentation of gifts. This is applied to the manner in which Christ ascended to heaven, after overcoming the powers that opposed the kingdom of God. But in accordance with his object the apostle represents the gifts received as imparted. As the communication of the Holy Spirit to believers is an evidence of the victory over the kingdom of darkness, so the special charisms are marked as the gifts of victory belonging to the glorified Christ. Examples of such a free use of Old Testament passages are to be found elsewhere in Paul's writings; compare Rom. x. 6, &c. The quotation in ch. v. 14, is certainly a problem to be explained, but we are not authorized to employ it in casting suspicion on the genuineness of the epistle. The appeal in ch. iii. 3, to what he said before, is certainly somewhat singular, and we can point out nothing similar in Paul. But the singularity is softened when we recollect that this is a circular epistle which was intended for several churches to whom Paul was personally unknown, and that what is said relates to the great novel idea of the one church of God, to be formed from Jews and Gentiles by faith in the Redeemer, an idea which was first set by Paul in the clearest light. The passage in ch. vi. 2, 3, is also remarkable; but if the apostle, expressing the precept in the Old Testament form, has added a sign, in order to mark the importance which from the Old Testament point of view is given to this precept, it appears to me to be at least no decisive mark against the genuineness of the epistle. In ch. iv. 28, I can find nothing so very strange in such a connexion: "He who hitherto, through idleness, has been led to steal from others, must labor as a Christian, not only that he may honestly gain his own livelihood, but in order to be able to show kindness to others. Let him, who has hitherto seized on the property of others, be changed into one who even maintains others in need by the produce of his own labor." The comparison of marriage with the relation of the church to Christ, ch. v. 23, appears to me, though not occurring elsewhere in Paul's writings, as perfectly consonant with Christian ideas, and by no means un-Pauline. Compare 1 Cor. vi. 15.

* For the confirmation of this relation of the two epistles to one another, the "and," *καί*, in Eph. vi. 21, certainly serves, which can only be explained by supposing that Paul had in his thoughts what he had been writing to the Colossians, iv. 8, according to the correct reading, "that he might know," *ἵνα γινῶτε*. Harless has noticed this mark in the Introduction to his Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 60, and after him Wiggers jun in the *Studien und Kritiken*; 1841, 2d part, p. 453.

the place in the introductory salutation is wanting in ancient manuscripts. But since the Ephesian church consisted for the most part of Gentile Christians, we have no reason to doubt that this epistle was equally designed for them, though being a circular letter, the apostle touched only on those circumstances and wants which were common to them with the other churches of this district. It might also be thought most proper that the epistle should be sent from Ephesus, as the metropolis and the seat of the mother-church, to the other churches. This would best agree with the designation which it generally obtained at an early period, as specially addressed to the Ephesian church. Yet from this remark we do not venture to infer too much, since the great preponderance of the Ephesian church, as one of the *sedes apostolicæ*, although the epistle at first might have had no precise designation, must have procured a predominant value to its name, as of one directed to the Ephesian church.*

In the second period of his confinement, Paul received a contribution from the church at Philippi (which had already given practical proof of its love for him) through Epaphroditus, their messenger, from whom also he received an account of their state. In consequence of this information, he had occasion to put the Christians at Philippi on their guard against the influence of Judaizing teachers, to exhort them to union amongst themselves, and to recommend to those who had more liberal and enlarged views, forbearance towards their weaker brethren. On this last topic he gives them, in the words of the exhortation which he added after the epistle was already closed, the important rule, that all should seek to employ faithfully the measure of knowledge which they had already attained (iii. 15), that then God would reveal to them what they still wanted, and thus all would by degrees arrive at a right state of Christian maturity.† He exhorted them, under the persecutions to which the Christians in Macedonia were still exposed, to bear joyfully their sufferings for Christ's sake, and to view them as a gift of grace which was vouchsafed to them.

Everything in this epistle, the state of mind with which the writer contemplates impending death, the manner in which he judges of himself, his pathetic exhortations to the church, all bear the inimitable impress of Paul. A later writer attempting to forge a letter in his name, would not have made him express himself with that apparent uncertainty in reference to his future lot, iii. 11, 12.‡

* The well-founded reaction against the subjective arbitrariness of a one-sided negative criticism, must not seduce us into a superstitious overvaluation of tradition, which in its turn may lead to mere arbitrary assertions, instead of that result which offers itself from the comprehensive survey of Christian antiquity.

† The gloss of the common reading (*κατόνι, τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν*), which injures the meaning, arose from mistaking the sense of the passage, and supposing that it referred to Christian unity, and not to the agreement of practice with knowledge.

‡ In the severe language against the Judaizing proselyte-makers, (Phil. iii. 2, 3,) I certainly cannot with Baur find anything un-Pauline. The predicate "dogs," *κύνες*, as a

CHAPTER X.

PAUL'S LABORS AFTER HIS RELEASE FROM HIS FIRST CONFINEMENT AT ROME, TO HIS MARTYRDOM.

HITHERTO we have possessed certain information respecting the circumstances and labors of the apostle Paul during his confinement at Rome. But in reference to the sequel, we meet on all sides with great obscurity and uncertainty. The question arises, whether he ended this confinement with martyrdom, or whether he was released from it, and entered afresh on his apostolic labors. The decision of this question depends, partly on the depositions of historical witnesses, partly on the result of an examination of Paul's Second Epistle to Timothy, on whether this epistle, which was evidently written during a confinement at Rome, must be classed among the epistles written in the time of his first confinement, or whether we must assume the existence of a second. The narratives of the fourth century, according to which Paul was set at liberty and published the gospel in Spain, cannot be taken into account, for all these might very easily arise from what he says in his Epistle to the Romans of his intentions of visiting Spain. But more attention is due to an account which is given by a man who was in part a contemporary, and probably a disciple of Paul. Clement, the bishop of Rome,

designation of shameless men, is not at all extraordinary. It perfectly comports with the indignation of Paul against those persons who would mislead Christians, and turn them aside from seeking salvation, that he should term the mere outward circumcision a *καταρτομή*, as in Gal. v. 12; it is, also, altogether Pauline when Christians are termed "the true circumcision who worship God in the spirit," Rom. ii. 29. It is also by no means far-fetched, but very naturally connected, when Paul, who had to fight far and near with these Judaizers, is induced to oppose his own example to what was the only glory of these persons, that he could boast of all those distinctions in the highest degree, but counted them all as nothing in order to seek his righteousness in Christ alone, which is followed by that most glorious passage, iii. 9-15, which breathes entirely the spirit of Paul. That in i. 1, the deacons immediately succeed the bishops, is a mark which testifies against a somewhat later time, in which bishops and presbyters already began to be distinguished. But the name of Clement (iv. 3.) reminds Dr. Baur at once of his hobby-horse, the Clementines, and calls up, by the association of ideas, Peter, Simon Magus, the Gnostics, and many others whom no one else would have thought of meeting in this epistle. What allusions indeed may not be found, when (ii. 4-7) one is led to think of the Valentinian Sophia, which would penetrate into the essence of Bythos, and sink down into Chaos, and when Christ is thought to form a contrast to it? or when Schwegler considers Euodias to be a symbol of the Jewish-Christian party, and Syntyche a symbol of the Gentile Christians, and under the phrase "true yoke-fellow," *σύζυγος γνήσιος*, (with reference to the Clementines) would find the apostle Peter as one pointed out from a conciliatory point of view? See *das nachapostolische Zeitalter*, vol. ii. p. 135.

says expressly in his first epistle to the Corinthians, (§ 5,)* that Paul suffered martyrdom, after he had travelled to the boundaries of the West.† By this expression, we most naturally understand Spain; and though Clement might have understood by it some other place or country than exactly this, yet we cannot in any case suppose that a person writing at Rome should have understood anything else by it.‡ From .

* What we learn from the only natural interpretation of this passage could not have occurred, if what Schenkel has remarked, in his *Dissertation* against a second confinement of Paul (in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1841, part 1) respecting Clement's Epistle, be correct; namely, that it was written only a few years after the Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, between the years 64 and 65; but we cannot at all agree with this opinion. The inference from § 41, where the author expresses himself as if the temple and temple-worship at Jerusalem were still in existence, cannot countervail those passages of this epistle which contain the most undeniable marks of a later period; as § 44, on the election to church-offices; § 47, where it is presupposed that Paul wrote the First Epistle to the Corinthians at the beginning of the publication (or of *his* publication) of the gospel (*ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*). And it appears that the author knew nothing of any epistle written to the Corinthians by Paul *before our first* epistle to them. I also think that Clement would have expressed himself otherwise in § 5, if he had written only a few years after Paul's martyrdom. The allusions to the Epistle to the Hebrews also indicate a much later date. The manner in which Schenkel has thought that the Epistle of Clement can be brought into connection with Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians, I must regard as the more unfortunate the less I am able to recognise in it an epistle that proceeded from a definite reference to certain immediately visible circumstances of a particular church.

† The *μαρτυρεῖν* in this connexion, "*μαρτυρήσας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων*," is to be understood probably, not in the later meaning of martyrdom, but in the original sense of bearing testimony to the faith, although with a reference to the death of Paul which was brought on by this confession. "He bore testimony of his faith before the heathen magistrates." At all events, the words *ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων* must be understood as a general designation of the heathen magistrates; and we cannot suppose that Clement intended to give a precise chronological mark, or to refer to the persons to whom at that time the chief management of public affairs was committed in Rome.

‡ Schrader, indeed, adopts Ernesti's opinion, that by *τέρμα τῆς δύσεως* may be meant the boundaries of the west towards the east, and thus nothing else be intended than that Paul had just reached as far as the boundaries of the west. But though we are willing to allow that the words might in themselves be so understood, yet it is impossible so to understand them in this connexion. For Clement had just said that Paul proclaimed the gospel in the East and in the West (*κήρυξ γενόμενος ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ δύσει*) that he had taught righteousness to the *whole world* (*δικαιοσύνην διδάξας ὅλον τὸν κόσμον*), and then follow the words *ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως ἐλθών*. In this connexion, Clement must surely have intended to say that Paul advanced far into the West. It may here be remarked, that Clement must have known more of the events in general of Paul's life, for he says that Paul was seven times put in fetters. Even after what has been said since the publication of this work against this interpretation and application of the passage in Clement, I cannot prevail on myself to give it up; and I am pleased to find critics like Credner, who hold the same views. How can it be imagined that Clement, if he thought only of Paul's first confinement at Rome, could say that he had published the gospel not merely in the East, but also in the West, and had come even to the boundaries of the West? Even if we allow much for the rhetorical form of the expression, we cannot consider this as a proper designation of such a fact; and why should a writer who had at hand so many rhetorical designations for the metropolis of the world, have chosen precisely this the most unnatural? It also appears to me a torturing of the word, something impossible, that

this account of Clement, if we must infer that Paul carried into effect his intention of travelling into Spain, or that, at least, he went beyond Italy, we are also obliged to admit, that he was released from his confinement at Rome. And we should be obliged to abide by this opinion, if we had no further information of the circumstances of Paul during his second confinement, if we could also place his Second Epistle to Timothy in the time of his first imprisonment.

If we depart from this last supposition, we can put two cases ; either that Paul wrote this epistle at the beginning or at the end of his confinement. As to the first case, we know that Paul came to Rome without Timothy, but that he was afterwards in his society. It may be therefore supposed, that he was called by this very epistle from Lesser Asia to Rome, and that from that time he remained constantly with him. But the information furnished by this epistle, of Paul's situation at that time, is entirely opposed to such a supposition. When he wrote it, he had already obtained a public audience, and had been heard in his defence. On the contrary, in the first period of his confinement, this had certainly not happened, since it is first mentioned in the Epistle to the Philippians. He then had his martyrdom in prospect, while his First Epistle during his confinement held out the most cheering hopes of his release.

If we take the second case, and consider this epistle as the last he wrote in that confinement at Rome, it will connect itself with the Epistle to the Philippians, with respect to the darker prospects of the apostle's situation, of which it contains several indications. But several other things do not agree with this supposition, and rather direct us to another date. And although not every particular which we could mention on this point has equal weight, yet all taken together are in favor of that view, according to which all the particulars can be most naturally and simply understood, in the manner which would first occur to an unprejudiced reader of the epistle. Paul desires Timothy to come to him, without any allusions to his having been already with him during his confinement. When we begin to read the epistle, everything gives the impression, that he had taken leave of Timothy in the place where the latter was now residing, and since that time had been put in confinement. He cautions him against the false teachers in his neighborhood (in Lesser Asia, probably at Ephesus), ii. 17, and speaks of them as if he had himself the opportunity of knowing them well from personal observation. This could not have been during his earlier residence in Lesser Asia, for at that time these heretical tendencies had not yet shown themselves, as appears from what we have before remarked ; but everything is easily explained if Paul, being released from confinement, travelled into Lesser Asia, as he intended, and entered into conflict with these false teachers, who had

Clement should have understood the word subjectively, from the position of Paul at the limit of his labors in the West, beyond which he was hindered from extending them into the West.

gained a footing there during his imprisonment. He informed Timothy of the result of his first public examination, iv. 16, and in a manner which implies that Timothy knew nothing before of it, and that it had taken place during his absence from Rome. But when Paul made his defence during his first confinement, Timothy was with him; (compare Philip. i. 7.) We are therefore led to think of something that happened during Paul's second confinement. There are, besides, many marks which indicate that he had come to the West by his usual route from Lesser Asia through Achaia, but which we know was not his route when he last came from Cæsarea to Jerusalem. He charges Timothy to bring with him the cloak, the books, and especially the parchments, which he had left behind at the house of a person whose name he mentions (2 Tim. iv. 13.) Now it is far more probable that he left these things behind after a visit to Troas some months before, than at a distance of four or six years, which we must suppose to have been the case if the epistle was written during his first confinement, and that they should be brought to him only after so long an interval.* In order to depict his state of desertion, he informs Timothy that Erastus, one of his usual companions, who probably was with him the last time in Lesser Asia,† stayed behind in his native place, Corinth; and that he had left another of his companions, Trophimus, sick at Miletum, 2 Tim. iv. 20.‡ Although we find

* It is an arbitrary assumption that these parchments contained documents relative to his defence, and that for that reason he now wished to have them.

† See Acts xix. 22. This could hardly be the same as the "chamberlain," οἰκονόμος, of Corinth, mentioned in Rom. xvi. 23, for his office would scarcely allow of his being so often with Paul on his missionary journeys.

‡ On the supposition that the epistle might have been written during Paul's first confinement, it is the most natural supposition that those persons are here spoken of, who had resolved to come to Rome (as Timothy knew), to the apostle's assistance on his trial, according to the usages of Roman law. One of them, Erastus, had not left Corinth as he intended, but remained there. Trophimus (who as a witness might have been of great service) they (the delegates of the churches in Lesser Asia who had agreed to travel together to Rome) had left on the way, sick, at Miletum (ἀπέλιπον, the third person plural). But certainly the other interpretation, in which nothing needs to be supplied, is the simplest, and that which would first occur to an unprejudiced reader of the epistle. Besides, if Paul had reminded Timothy of something which must have been known to him, in order to stir him up still more to set off without delay to Rome, (as Timothy, who was probably staying at Ephesus, must have known that the delegates from the churches had left Trophimus sick in his neighborhood,) he would have added some such word as "you know," οἴδας, to signify that he was merely reminding him of something he knew already. We may also doubt, whether the testimony of Trophimus was of so much consequence to Paul. The charge of raising a tumult at Jerusalem would probably not be so dangerous to him; on the contrary, he was most probably justified sufficiently, on his arrival at Rome, by the statements that were sent at the same time from the Roman authorities, whose inquiries had thus far led to a wholly favorable result. But the charge of having prompted Roman citizens to apostatize from the State religion, and of having propagated a *religio nova et illicita*, must have been the one really dangerous, and in this case Trophimus could be of no assistance to him.

several persons in Paul's society, who were also with him during his first confinement (though this circumstance will not serve to fix the date, since the same causes as at that time might bring them again into his society); yet among these is a Titus, who was not with him before, for we have not met with them together since the apostle's last sojourn in Macedonia and Achaia, and a Crescens, who is not named before as one of his companions.

Against the opinion that this epistle, in consequence of the marks we have indicated, was written in Paul's second confinement, it may indeed be objected, that we find in it no reference at all to an earlier confinement at Rome. But this will appear less strange, if we attend to the following considerations. By this epistle, the apostle by no means intended to give the first information to Timothy of his new confinement; he rather assumes, that this, and in part the peculiarities of his condition in it, were already known to him, as appears from i. 15,* and by means of the constant intercourse between the chief cities of the Roman Empire, and the lively interest taken by the churches in Paul's affairs, information respecting him must soon have reached Ephesus. Moreover, during this period after his release, so many things occurred in his renewed apostolic labors, which fully occupied the mind of one who was more affected by events relating to the kingdom of God than by any personal considerations, and thus necessarily pushed into the background the recollection of his former confinement, that in the prospect of martyrdom, he would fix his thoughts more on the future than on the past, especially in the presence of events that were likely to affect the progress of the kingdom of God on earth.

Now if we admit that Paul was released from that confinement, we must assume that he regained his freedom before the persecution against the Christians occasioned by the conflagration at Rome in the year 64; for had he been a prisoner at this time, he certainly would not have been spared. And it agrees with the chronological data which we have before discovered, that after more than a two years' imprisonment, he regained his freedom between the years 62 and 63, a result of the proceedings against him which in itself, and in connexion with existing circumstances, is by no means improbable. The accusation of raising a tumult at Jerusalem had been proved to be unfounded; but the opposition of Christianity to the State religion had not then attracted public attention, and though this fact could not have passed altogether unnoticed, yet no definite law existed on the subject, and under the Emperor Nero, who ridiculed the established religion, and gave himself little concern about the ancient Roman enactments, such a point might

* This passage may be most naturally understood of a number of Christians from Lesser Asia, who, on coming to Rome, were afraid to visit Paul in his confinement, and had already returned home when he wrote this epistle. Paul makes them known to Timothy by specifying two of their number.

more easily have been waived. The friends whom Paul had gained by his behavior during his confinement, and by the manner of conducting his defence, would probably exert their influence in his favor. Thus it might be explained that he regained his freedom; and the ancient tradition that he was beheaded,* and not crucified like Peter, if true, favors his not having suffered death in the persecution of 64; for had he been put to death in that persecution, so much regard would not have been paid to his Roman citizenship as to spare the hated leader of a detested sect from the more painful and ignominious mode of execution.

From the epistles written by Paul during his first confinement, we learn that he labored much at Rome in publishing the gospel; his firm advocacy of the cause of God, and his happy release, must have had a beneficial influence in this respect. Hence it came to pass, that Christianity from this time spread with still greater power among the Gentiles in Rome. But by this very means the new sect, while gaining ground among the heathen to the injury of idolatry, drew on itself the attention of the fanatical people who could not feel otherwise than hostile to the enemies of their gods; and the hatred thus excited soon occasioned the report to be spread of unnatural crimes committed in the assemblies of these impious persons. Perhaps also the Jews, who were more embittered against the Christians when their designs against Paul proved abortive, contributed their part to excite the popular hatred against them. But a persecution on the part of the state would hardly have been threatened so soon, if the Emperor Nero had not availed himself of the popular feeling, which easily credited everything bad of the Christians, in order to cast an odium on the Christians which he wished to throw off from himself.† Yet it by no means appears that this outbreak against the Christians in Rome was followed by a general persecution against them throughout the provinces, and hence Paul might meanwhile continue his apostolic labors without molestation in distant parts.

As for the history of his labors in this new field, we have no information respecting it; nor can the total want of sources for this part of church history be at all surprising. But this defect of information cannot be made use of to render doubtful the fact of Paul's second confinement. Nothing, therefore, is left for us, but to compare the short account (already mentioned) in the Epistle of Clemens Romanus, with what Paul himself tells us respecting his intentions in case he regained his freedom, in the epistles written during his first confinement, and with what may be gathered from his other letters, which it seems probable that he wrote after his release.

Before his confinement, Paul had expressed the intention of going into Spain, and the testimony of the Roman Clement favors the belief that he fulfilled this intention. But during his confinement at Rome he had altered his views, and was determined, by reasons which we have already noticed, to visit once more the scene of his early labors in Lesser Asia.

* See Eusebius, ii. 25.

† On this persecution in Rome, see my Church History, vol. i. p. 94.

The Second Epistle to Timothy contains hints of his returning by his usual route through Achaia. But it would be possible that after his release he travelled first into Spain;* that he there exerted himself in the establishment of Christian churches, and then revisited the former sphere of his ministry; that he was on his return to the West, in order to close there his apostolic commission, but that in passing through Rome, before he could resume his journey he was arrested and imprisoned.—However, the want of any memorial of his labors in Spain, the want of any record of an *ecclesia apostolica*, does not favor the supposition that Paul spent any length of time in that country; and hence the other explanation, that he first renewed his labors in the East, then betook himself to Spain, and soon after his arrival was arrested, seems to deserve the preference.

We, therefore, are of opinion that Paul first fulfilled his intention of returning to Lesser Asia. Now the First Epistle of Paul to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus, by the peculiarities of their mode of expression, and the peculiar references to ecclesiastical relations, connect themselves so closely with the Second Epistle to Timothy, and exhibit so many marks of the later apostolic age (one of which we have already noticed), that it appears admissible to assign both these epistles to this period.

In the earlier history of the apostle, we can find no point of time in which he could have written such a letter to Timothy at Ephesus, in reference to the concerns of that church, as his first epistle;†

* Mynster, with whom I am glad that I can agree in many other particulars in my view of this part of the apostolic history, supposes this in his discussion *de ultimis annis muneris apostolici a Paulo gesti*, in his *kleine theologischen Schriften*, p. 234.

† The genuineness of the First Epistle to Timothy being presupposed, the view I have here taken of the relations and circumstances under which it was written, appears to be the only tenable one. But I confess that I am not convinced of the genuineness of the First Epistle to Timothy, with the same certainty as of the Pauline origin of other Pauline Epistles, and even of the Epistles to the Ephesians, the Philippians, the Colossians, and Philemon. What is said in this epistle of the false teachers excites no suspicion in my mind; and I can find nowhere the allusions to the later gnostic doctrines, which Baur would find in this as well as in the other Pastoral Letters. The germ of such Judaizing Gnosticism, or of a Judaizing theosophic ascetic tendency, as it shows itself in the two Epistles to Timothy, I would presuppose *a priori* to be existing at this time, since the appearances of the second century point back to such a tendency gradually evolving itself out of Judaism. In this respect, the absence of the marks of a later date in the controversial part of this epistle, is to me a proof of its high antiquity. To the declaration of Hegesippus, in Eusebius, iii. 32, that the falsifications of doctrine first began after the death of the apostle, or rather then ventured to make their public appearance, I can attach no such weight as historical evidence, as to cast a doubt on these undeniable facts. As there is an unhistorical tendency produced by a dogmatic bias, which transposes the originators of all heresies to the apostolic age, and makes the apostles to be the first impugnors of them; so also there is a more unhistorical tendency, and equally proceeding from a dogmatic bias (as is the case with all the depositions of Hegesippus), which would maintain that, up to a certain date, the church was wholly pure, and that all heresies broke out first after the decease of the apostles. A common but one-sided truth lies at the bottom of both opinions. I can find nothing surprising in the fact, that, in the two

for this epistle presupposes a church already for some time in existence, in which such disorders had arisen as in many respects required a new organization of church relations, the displacing several of the leading officers of the church, and the appointment of others. The new class of false teachers who had sprung up in Lesser Asia during Paul's imprisonment, had acquired great influence in the Ephesian church. As Paul (according to an interpretation, not perhaps necessary of his farewell address at Miletus) had anticipated, several overseers of the churches had allowed themselves to be seduced by the spirit of false doctrine. The false teachers to whom we refer, bore the same marks which we find in those who appeared in the church at Colossæ during Paul's confinement. They belonged to the class of Judaizers, who maintained the perpetual obligation of the Mosaic law.* But they distinguished themselves from the common Judaizers by a theosophic ascetic tendency. They taught abstinence from certain kinds of food, and prescribed celibacy as essential to Christian perfection.† But they united with this practical tendency a theoretical peculiarity. They prided themselves on possessing a higher "knowledge," *γνῶσις*, (the *φιλοσοφία* of the Epistle to the Colossians), and by this they were seduced from the simplicity of the faith. They taught legendary tales respecting the origin and propagation of spirits, like the false teachers at Colossæ.‡ They brought forward subjects which gave rise

Epistles to Timothy, such an aspect of the present as an omen and germ of what would be developed in the future, is to be seen. The attentive observer, capable of deeper insight, must here behold the future in the present. But I cannot deny that, when I come from reading other Pauline epistles, and especially the two other Pastoral Letters, to this epistle, I feel myself struck by the impression of something not Pauline. More particularly, the mode of transition, appears to me not in the Pauline style,—as in ii. 7; iii., 1, 15; v. 17, 18; and the relation of this epistle to the two other Pastoral Letters is also suspicious. I can indeed find reasons for allaying these doubts, but none which, taken altogether, can satisfy the unprejudiced lover of truth. As to the two other Pastoral Letters, I will not deny that along with the impression of the genuine Pauline, and of what is against their composition at a later period, some things are to be found which might excite a doubt even in the mind of a critic not ill-disposed, but which will lead us to consider the very peculiar relation by which these epistles are distinguished from all the rest of Paul's.

* As appears from the Pauline antithesis, 1 Tim. i. 9.

† Among the "bodily exercises," *σωματικὴ γυμνασία*, 1 Tim. iv. 8, must without doubt be included a piety that consisted in outward gestures, abstinencies, and ceremonies, the opposite of which is true piety (*εὐσέβεια*) having its seat in the disposition.

‡ The genealogical investigations common among the Jews, by which they sought to trace their descent from persons of note in former times up to the Patriarchs, cannot certainly be intended in 1 Tim. i. 4, for inquiries of this sort could never be introduced among Gentiles, nor could their minds be so much occupied with them, that the additional marks given in the epistle would be applicable to them. Nor can we suppose a reference to inquiries respecting the genealogy of Jesus; what has just been said would in part apply to this supposition, and in this case Paul would have marked his meaning more precisely, and according to his usual antithetical style, contrasted the Christ according to the Spirit, *Χριστὸς κατὰ πνεῦμα*, with the Christ according to the flesh, *Χριστὸς κατὰ σὰρκα*. On the contrary, it will be quite suitable to apply it to the genealogy of

to subtle disputations, instead of leading men to accept in faith the divine means of their salvation ; 1 Tim. i. 4. The conflict with this false Gnosis now springing up, must have occupied the churches in these parts. As the prophets in the assemblies of believers frequently warned them of the dangers, which from the signs of the times they perceived were threatening the church ; so these warning voices spoke also of the conflict that awaited the church with this hostile tendency, which in following centuries was one of the severest which the simple gospel had to encounter. These are the express warnings of the Divine Spirit by the inspired addresses in the churches, to which Paul appeals.* To this peculiar state of the church several of those directions are applicable, which Paul gives in this epistle, relative to the appointment of their overseers.†

Paul, therefore, executed his intention of going into Lesser Asia, and found such disturbances in the churches there, arising from the influence of the unevangelical tendency we have noticed, that he held it to be absolutely necessary to remain longer in those parts. He left Ephesus, for reasons unknown to us, to visit the churches of Macedonia, but soon returned thither, and in the meanwhile left Timothy behind for the special purpose of counterworking these false teachers, which he considered an object of the first importance ; to this he added a subordinate object, the new organization of the church at Ephesus, and perhaps also the superintendence of some others in the neighborhood, which had since been formed.‡

the angels, *γενεαλογίας τῶν ἀγγέλων*, similar to the later gnostic pneumatologies ; on the supposition, indeed, that he wrote of them as already well known to Timothy. Any other person who had forged this epistle, partly for the purpose of employing the authority of Paul against the rising gnosis, would have more exactly marked the object of controversy.

* 1 Tim. iv. 1. A similar expression respecting prophetic intimations occurs in Acts xx. 23.

† The different manner in which Paul expresses himself on marriage in 1 Tim. ii. 15, and in the First Epistle to the Corinthians (see pp. 235, 246), could also be used as a mark of the not-Pauline origin of the First Epistle to Timothy. But yet we should not rate this so high without the addition of other reasons. For as we must distinguish two elements in Paul's judgment respecting marriage, the new Christian idea of it, and his inclination to unmarried life founded in his peculiar life's task and in his view of the impending future, so could one or the other of these predominate in him in different relations or at different times. When, in opposition to those who prescribed the unconditioned necessity of marriage he ascribed a certain value to unmarried life, so must he have had occasion, through an unchristian condemnation or degradation of marriage, to give prominence to the other side. In opposition to those persons, who led females to forget altogether the proper destiny of their sex, and to thrust themselves forward as public teachers, Paul says, 1 Tim. ii. 15, that the woman would certainly be saved in family life (the *διὰ* is to be understood in the sense of—*by means of*, *in*—as it is often used by Paul), if she lead a holy life in faith and love (or *διὰ* may be understood as serving to connect with the whole remaining part of the sentence, and the "childbearing," *τεκνογονία*, as referring to the education of children for the kingdom of God.)

‡ That Paul does not mention in this epistle his deliverance from confinement at Rome,

If we regard the geographical position of the places, it agrees very well with Paul's residence in Lesser Asia, and his travelling thence to Macedonia, that at this time he visited the Island of Crete, and there left his disciple Titus, to whom he addressed an epistle. It is indeed easy to imagine, that, as Paul had often sojourned for a longer time in those parts, he had already founded several churches in Crete. But besides that, for reasons before mentioned, we are led to fix the date of this epistle nearer that of the two other Pastoral Letters, it is also striking that, while Luke in the Acts reports so fully and circumstantially the occurrences of the apostle's last voyage to Rome, and mentions his stay at Crete, he says not a word (contrary to his usual practice in such cases) of the friendly reception given to him by the Christians there, or even of his meeting with them at all. Hence we may conclude that no Christian churches yet existed in the island, though that transient visit would naturally give rise to the intention of planting the gospel there; which he probably fulfilled soon after he was set at liberty, when he came into those parts. As in the last period before his journey to Jerusalem we do not find Titus in his company, and on the other hand we find, in the Second Epistle to Timothy, that he was with the apostle, this agrees very well with the supposition that Paul after his release once more met with him in Lesser Asia, and again took him as his associate in preaching the gospel.

After Paul had laid the foundation of the Christian church in Crete, he left Titus behind to complete the organization of the churches, to confirm the new converts in purity of doctrine, and to counteract the influence of the false teachers. If we compare the marks of the false teachers in the two other Pastoral Epistles with those in the Epistle to Titus, we shall find a similarity. But if we are not sustained in this, (as we are not authorized to suppose the same appearances of the religious spirit in Crete and in Ephesus,*) neither shall we be led by what can be

proves nothing against this statement, for a number of events had intervened to occupy his mind, especially when he wrote this epistle. It is indeed surprising that he should charge Timothy to "let no man despise his youth," since Timothy could be no longer a youth. But we must recollect how indefinitely such terms are often used, and that Paul, when he wrote this, might have special reasons for such an injunction; among the leaders of the unevangelical party, there might be persons whose great age had secured for them deference and respect. The passages in Titus ii. 15, and also 2 Tim. ii. 22, (which in that connexion has nothing strange,) present no fit parallel; and if in the First Epistle to Timothy, traces can be found of an imitation of the two others, these words may certainly be regarded as additional traces, and may proceed from a misunderstanding of the second passage.

* I cannot, with De Wette, consider it so extraordinary that so much is said respecting false doctrines in the new churches, nor that Paul deemed it necessary to direct the attention of Titus to the fact, who, from long observation, must have been well aware of the danger. The fermenting process in the development of Christianity at that time, might easily extend its influence from one district to another, as soon as Christianity had found its entrance into men's minds, and hence, from the first, Christianity was threatened by dangerous disturbing forces. Along with the seeds of Christianity, these foreign elements might spread from Asia Minor, or Achaia, to Crete. For a considerable time the seeds of

inferred simply from the epistle itself, to imagine any other object of Paul's opposition and warning than the common Judaizing tendency, and a blind, spiritless, pharisaic knowledge of the Scriptures, disputatious, cleaving to the letter, and losing itself in useless hair-splittings and rabbinical fables.* Paul required of Titus to turn the attention of men to objects altogether different and of practical advantage, deeply to impress on their minds the doctrine which formed the basis of salvation, and to lead them to apply this fundamental truth to real life, and to be zealous to verify their faith by good works.†

Christianity might have been scattered before there had been the means of organizing a church. Paul felt himself compelled to warn Titus of the danger, of which he had gained information in Crete itself, and from other quarters. The defects in the character of the people appeared to him to render great circumspection necessary; these defects are noticed by Polybius, (vi. 46, § 3 :) *Καθόλου δ' ὁ περὶ τὴν αἰσχροκέρδειαν καὶ πλεονεξίαν τρόπος οὕτως ἐπιχωριάζει παρ' αὐτοῖς, ὥστε παρὰ μόνοις Κρηταιεῦσι τῶν ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων μηδὲν αἰσχρὸν νομίζεσθαι κέρδος.* (Covetousness and greediness are so universal and customary among the Cretans, that among them, of all men, no scheme of gain is esteemed base); and § 5, *Οὔτε κατ' ἰδίαν ἤθη δολιώτερα Κρηταίων εὗροι τις ἄν.* (Neither can any one find individual dispositions more deceitful than those of the Cretans.) Paul probably had these national vices in his mind when he laid down the qualifications that were necessary for the office of presbyter.

* As to the genealogies in Titus iii. 9, if we compare this passage with the "endless genealogies" in 1 Tim. i. 4, we shall be led to understand a reference to a theosophic element, an emanation doctrine; yet this expression in the Epistle to Titus, without anything more definite, and simply in its own connection, favors no such supposition; but we shall be induced to think of the common Jewish genealogies, although we cannot determine precisely for what object these would be employed, and the comparison of 1 Tim. i. 4 with Titus iii. 9, might excite a suspicion of a misunderstood copying by the former.

† All that is said in opposition to this tendency bears the impress of being truly apostolic and Pauline. If the passage in Titus iii. 10 were to be understood in the sense of the later unchristian hatred of heretics, the passage in iii. 2 would be in direct contradiction to it, for in this an exactly opposite disposition is expressed; Christians are here warned of spiritual pride, which might mislead them to exalt themselves as believers and children of God against the heathen, to treat them as enemies, to insult them on account of their superstition and the vices prevalent amongst them. On the contrary, it was their duty to cherish gentleness and kindness towards them, from the consciousness that they, like the heathen, were once the slaves of delusion and of sin, and owed their deliverance from this state, not to their own merits, but to divine grace alone, Titus iii. 2. f But the sentiment here expressed, if rightly understood, by no means contradicts the injunction which Paul gives to Titus in iii. 10. In this latter passage, by those who bring in "heresies," *αἵρέσεις* (Gal. v. 20), a class of persons are referred to different from those in the former, such at least as went to greater lengths, separated from Christian fellowship on account of their peculiar opinions, and founded open schisms. Now Paul advised Titus to enter into no disputations with persons who wished to make these schisms, respecting the peculiarities to which they attached so much importance; but if they were not disposed to listen to repeated admonitions, to avoid all further intercourse with them, since such disputations could be of no advantage, and tended only to injure the hearers, and throw their minds into a state of perplexity. Such persons, whose errors were interwoven with their whole character, were not to be convinced by argument. And as he reprobated their whole mental tendency in reference to religion as unpractical, it followed, of course, that he admonished his disciples not to engage with his adversaries on this position, but if they would not listen to repeated exhortations to return to evangelical simplicity, they should

When Paul wrote this letter to Titus he had the prospect of spending the winter at Nicopolis, where he wished Titus to join him. As there were so many cities in different parts, which, having been built on the occasion of some victory, were called Nicopolis, and we have no exact information respecting the travels of the apostle in this last period of his ministry, and the exact dates are wanting, we cannot determine what city is here intended, whether we are to look for it in Cilicia, Macedonia, Thrace, or Epirus. We might suppose that the city built in the last-named country by Augustus to commemorate the sea-fight at Actium was intended; but at all events, it appears from the plan of his journey indicated in the Second Epistle to Timothy, that Paul was come from Lesser Asia into the West, and that he had probably taken final leave of his beloved Timothy at Ephesus.

As soon as he had returned to the West, he fulfilled his purpose of publishing the gospel in Spain. But there he was soon seized and sent as a prisoner to Rome.* After he had been in confinement a long time, and had been subjected to one judicial examination, he wrote his last Epistle to Timothy, whom (as we have just said) he probably had left behind at Ephesus. His situation at this time was evidently very different from that in which he found himself during his first confinement after his examination. It was *then* universally allowed that he was a prisoner, not on account of any moral or political offence, but only for publishing the gospel, and his example gave many courage boldly to confess their faith. But *now* he appeared in his fetters, as an "evil-doer," ii. 9, for all Christians in Rome were considered as *malefici*. Only a few had the courage openly to show themselves as his friends and companions in the faith. *Then* he was in a state of uncertainty between the expectation of martyrdom and of release, though the latter was more probable. *Now*, on the contrary, he looked forward to martyrdom as the more probable event. He informed Timothy, indeed, that the Lord had granted him power to testify confidently of the faith, and that he would be delivered from the jaws of the lion, from the death that was then threatening

be left to themselves. In perfect accordance with this injunction, is that which Paul gives Timothy in 2 Tim. ii. 23, to avoid "foolish and unlearned questions," since they only engendered strife, but "with meekness to instruct those that oppose themselves," to try whether they might not be led to repent of their errors, and be brought to an acknowledgement of the truth. Here also, as in the Epistle to Titus, he forbids arguing with these false teachers on their erroneous opinions. It was quite a different thing to point out the right way to those opponents of whose recovery some hopes might be entertained, and to this class the first passage refers.

* It may indeed appear remarkable that Paul, during the last part of Nero's reign, at a time when arbitrary cruelty so predominated, when Christians were so much the object of public hatred, still enjoyed so favorable a situation as a prisoner, so that he could see his friends and write epistles. But the exact situation of prisoners depended so much on accidental circumstances, that we cannot draw certain conclusions respecting it merely from the general state of things. Some Christians might, for aught we can tell, enjoy these privileges even amidst the most violent persecutions.

him;* still he was far from indulging the hope of being freed altogether from the danger of death. But this confidence he did enjoy, that the Lord would deliver him from all moral evil,† and preserve him to his heavenly kingdom. As Paul did not ascribe the power of persisting steadfastly in the confession of the faith even unto death to himself, but to the power of God, who strengthened him for this purpose;—he therefore thus expressed himself, that the Lord would uphold him steadfast under all conflicts even until death, preserve him from all unfaithfulness, and thus lead him to blessedness in his kingdom. The apostle's feelings in the prospect of martyrdom are inimitably expressed in his last epistle;‡ his elevated composure, his self-forgetfulness, his tender fatherly care for his disciple Timothy, his concern for the cause of the gospel which he was about to leave exposed to so many attempts to adulterate it, and yet his confidence in the divinity of that cause, and in the almightiness of God watching over it and conducting its development, a confidence that rose victorious over every doubt.

When he wrote the Epistle to the Philippians, and the end of his earthly course was not yet in sight, he said, referring to the defects and infirmities of which he was conscious as a man, that he was far from believing that he had already attained his aim—perfection; but that he was continually striving after that aim, if he might attain that for which he was called by Christ, Philip. iii. 12. But since he now saw himself actually at the end of his course—since he now looked back on that course as finished, with the prospect of approaching martyrdom, and by the power of the Lord had remained faithful under all his conflicts hitherto—and since he was animated by the confident persuasion that, by the

* The words 2 Tim. iv. 17, may be taken as a figurative expression, to denote generally deliverance from apparently impending death. But it would be also possible to understand them literally, for at that time it would be always possible that Paul, notwithstanding his Roman citizenship, might have reason to apprehend so shameful a death, though he was finally exempted from it.

† After Paul had said, 2 Tim. iv. 17, that the Lord had delivered him from impending death, he expressed the hope that he would still further deliver him. But this it was needful for him more distinctly to define and limit, for he would have said more than, under the circumstances, he was warranted to expect, if he had not added a limiting clause,—namely, that God would deliver him from all moral evil, such as want of fidelity to the gospel, and thus bring him victorious out of all conflicts into his heavenly kingdom; whether he had in his thoughts that participation in the kingdom of heaven, which he hoped to attain by martyrdom, in a fuller communion with Christ and God, or his deliverance to a participation in the perfected kingdom of Christ after his second coming; as he felt certain, if he were preserved from all evil, of partaking in this kingdom of Christ, whether he lived to that time or died before it came. I will not now attempt to decide between these two modes of interpretation. But one of them, in connexion with what goes before, must necessarily be taken. I cannot allow that these words are a contradiction to 2 Tim. iv. 6–8, nor assent to what Credner, in his *Einleitung*, i. p. 478, founds upon it.

‡ How strong the contrast between the simple manner in which Paul expresses himself, and the exaggerations and bombastic style of after times, such as we should have to expect in a later writer who had forged an epistle in the name of Paul.

same power, he would be brought forth victorious from the conflicts that still awaited him,*—at this critical moment, resting alone on the divine promise, all uncertainty vanished from his soul, and he could with assurance say of himself, “I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness.” 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8.†

He was far less occupied with thoughts about himself, than with anxiety for the church which he was on the point of leaving in a vehement conflict then beginning, both internal and external, but the dangers of the internal conflict were those which gave him the greatest uneasiness. In Lesser Asia, he had been brought into frequent collision with a false Jewish-Christian Gnosis, which was spreading in opposition to the simple gospel. He saw in spirit that this false tendency was continually gaining ground, and that, by its arts of deception, it was seducing numbers. Still, he was confident, that its deceptions would at last be exposed, and that the Lord would maintain that gospel which he had entrusted to his ministry, and without him, preserve it pure until the day of his second coming.‡ Since he might assume, that these false teachers were known to Timothy, and had no doubt often conferred with him on the means of counteracting them, he satisfied himself with a general delineation of their character. He mentioned amongst others, those who taught that the resurrection was already past (like the later Gnostics), and who probably explained everything which Christ had said respecting the resurrection, of the spiritual awakening by the divine power of the gospel. From this single mark we may conclude, that in general they indulged in a very arbitrary treatment of the historical facts of religion, as far as these did not harmonize with their preconceived opinions.§

* This confidence he also expressed in Philip. i. 20.

† Hence there is no contradiction whatever between the judgment Paul expresses of himself in this epistle and in that to the Philippians.

‡ If we picture to ourselves how Paul was then occupied with the thoughts of death, how uncertain his condition, and under what perplexing relations Timothy found himself in the field of labors where Paul had left him, we cannot deem it very surprising that he should communicate to him these fuller instructions, although he still hoped to see him again in Rome.

§ It may be doubted whether Alexander the coppersmith, mentioned in 2 Tim. iv. 14, belonged to the number of these false teachers. In this case, he would be the same as the person mentioned in 1 Tim. i. 20. It would indeed be possible that this false teacher from Lesser Asia, exasperated at being excluded by Paul from church communion, when he came to Rome, sought to take revenge on the apostle. And “our words,” *ἡμέτεροι λόγοι*, 2 Tim. iv. 15, might then be understood, not of the Christian doctrine generally, but of the pure exposition of the evangelical doctrine as it was given by Paul. But a Gentile or Jew of Lesser Asia might be intended, who violently persecuted Christianity. In this case, he would be distinct from the person mentioned in the First Epistle to Timothy; and it would be on that account by no means clear, that the author of the First Epistle to Timothy was some one else than Paul, who, from a mistake, had made Alexander a false teacher, and had classed him with Hymenæus; for why should

We cannot determine with certainty the year in which Paul's martyrdom occurred. We can only place it in one of the last of Nero's reign. And with this supposition another circumstance agrees. At this time most probably the Epistle to the Hebrews was written by an apostolic man of the Pauline school.* At its conclusion, xiii. 23, we find mention made of the lately obtained release of Timothy, whom we cannot suppose to be any other than the disciple and companion of Paul. It was Paul's desire that he should come to him, and the zealous sympathy which he evinced had the effect of causing him to be apprehended as one of the most active members of the hated sect. If this happened at the time of the Neronian persecution, Timothy would probably have shared the fate of all the Christians at Rome who could then be discovered. But if it happened some years later, it is not improbable that, by the influence of particular circumstances, Timothy obtained his freedom after the martyrdom of Paul.

not so common a name as Alexander belong to two different persons in Lesser Asia? There is no ground whatever to suppose that this Alexander was the same who is mentioned in Acts xix. 33, for it is far from being evident that he was so violent an enemy of Christianity; the Jews put him forward, not to make complaints against the Christians or Paul, but rather to prevent the rage of the heathens against the enemies of their gods from being turned against themselves.

* See Bleek's Introduction to this Epistle, p. 434.

BOOK IV.

A REVIEW OF THE LABORS OF JAMES AND PETER DURING THIS PERIOD.

CHAPTER I.

JAMES.

As along with that unity of the spirit which proceeded from Christ, we have observed an important difference existing in the forms of its representation among the apostles, so the apostle Paul, and that James who was known as a brother of the Lord, present the most striking contrast to each other, whether we regard their natural peculiarities, the formation of their Christian characters, or the sphere of their labors. In Paul, Christianity is exhibited in its most decided self-subsistence, wholly freed from the preparatory garb of Judaism; while James represents the new spirit under the ancient form, and we may observe in him the gradual transition from the old to the new. Hence Paul and James mark the two extreme limits in the development of Christianity from Judaism; as Paul was the chief instrument for presenting Christianity to mankind as the new creation, so was James for exhibiting the organic connexion of Christianity with the preparatory and prefiguring system of Judaism. After the martyrdom of the elder James, who was a son of Zebedee and brother of John, only one specially influential person of this name appears in Christian history, who stood at the head of the church at Jerusalem, and under the titles of *the Brother of the Lord*, and *the Just*, was held in the highest esteem by Christians of Jewish descent. But from ancient times it has been doubted, whether this James was, strictly speaking, a brother of the Lord, that is, either a son of Joseph by a former marriage, or more probably a later son of Mary,* and therefore, a different person from the apostle, the son of Alpheus; or whether he was in a general sense a relation of Jesus, a son of Mary's sister, a son

* See *Life of Christ*, § 22, or p. 29.

of Cleopas or Alpheus, and accordingly identical with the apostle of this name.*

* This question is one of the most difficult in the apostolic history. Dr. Schneckenburger, in his acute and profound investigation (in his *Annotatio ad Epistolam Jacobi*, Stuttgart, 1832, p. 144,) has brought the hypothesis of only one James to a higher degree of probability than it had before attained, and has said many things deserving consideration, and tending to remove the difficulties attached to it; but after all his remarks, many reasons for doubting remain. Later investigations, especially those of Credner in his *Einführung*, p. 573, have thrown additional weight into the opposite scale. We wish to present in an impartial manner the arguments for and against this hypothesis. Since, after the death of James the son of Zebedee, only one James is mentioned as one of the most influential men in the first apostolic church, and ranking with those apostles who were most esteemed, there is the highest probability that this James was no other than the only apostle still living of this name. If the term "brother," ἀδελφός, is understood only in a laxer sense, the title of "brother of the Lord" proves nothing against the identity of the person; for, from comparing Matt. xxvii. 56, xxviii. 1, Mark xv. 40, with John xix. 25, it is evident that James the apostle, son of Alpheus or Cleopas (both names, with different pronunciations, derived from the Hebrew יֵשׁוּעַ), was really a son of Mary's sister the mother of Jesus. As so near a relation of Jesus, he might accordingly be distinguished from the other apostles by the title of a brother of the Lord. But then it is asked, Why was he not rather distinguished by the strictly appropriate name of "cousin," ἀνεψιός? And if at that time there were persons in existence who might with strict propriety be called "*brothers of the Lord*," is it not so much less probable, that this surname in an improper sense would be applied to him? Nevertheless, we may suppose, that in common discourse—since it was not a point of consequence to mark definitely the degree of kin between Jesus and this James, but only to represent him in general terms as enjoying the honor of near relationship to the Lord,—it had become customary to designate him simply a brother of the Lord, especially among the Judaizing Christians, by whom such distinctions of earthly affinity would be most highly prized; and this might be still more easily explained, if we admit with Schneckenburger, that after the death of Joseph (which took place at an early period), Mary removed to the house of her sister, the wife of Alpheus; hence, it would be usual to designate her sons who lived from their childhood with Jesus, who had no other brothers, simply as the brethren of Jesus. Thus, then, this James would be one of the brethren of Jesus who are named in Matt. xiii. 55, Mark vi. 3. Among these we find a Josea, who, in Matt. xxvii. 56, is distinguished as the brother of James, and a Judas; and if the designation Ἰακώβου, given to the apostle Judas is to be explained, on comparing it with the Epistle of Jude, v. 1, by supplying the word "brother," (which cannot be assumed as absolutely certain,) we shall also again find in him a brother of the apostle James. And the one named Simon among these brethren, we may perhaps find again in the list of the apostles, as all three are named together in Acts i. 13. According to that supposition, it would be no longer surprising that the brethren of Christ are often mentioned in connexion with his mother; and yet from that circumstance no evidence can be deduced that would prove them to be in a strict sense his brethren. We must then assume with Schneckenburger, that when Matthew (xiii. 55), after the mention of the twelve apostles, distinguishes the brethren of Jesus from them, it proceeded from the want of chronological exactness in his mode of narration.

But if several of the so-called brethren of Jesus were among the apostles, still the manner in which the former are distinguished from the latter in Acts i. 14, is remarkable. Besides, according to the account in Mark iii. 31, a state of mind towards Jesus is supposed to exist in these brethren, which could not be attributed to the apostles, and yet it appears from comparing this account with the parallel passages in Matt. xii. and Luke viii. that this incident must be placed after the choice of the twelve apostles. This view is confirmed by the disposition manifested by these brethren of Christ, even in the last half-

If we put together all that is handed down to us in the New Testament, and in other historical records, the most probable result of the

year before his sufferings, vii. 3. All this taken together, must decide us in favor of the supposition, that the brethren of Jesus, commonly mentioned in connexion with Mary the mother of Jesus, are to be altogether distinguished from the apostles, and therefore they must be considered as the brethren of Jesus in a stricter sense, either as the sons of Joseph by a former marriage, or the later born sons of Joseph and Mary, which from Matt. i. 25, is most probable. That Christ when dying said to John, that from that time he should treat Mary as his mother, can at all events oppose only the supposition, that these brethren were the offspring of Joseph and Mary, and not the supposition that they were the step-sons of Mary. But even against the first supposition this objection is not decisive; for if these brethren of Jesus still continued estranged from him in their disposition, we can at once perceive why at his death he commended his mother to his beloved disciple John. It may indeed appear surprising, that these brethren of Christ, according to Matthew xiii. 55, bore the same names as his cousins, but this can be affirmed with certainty only of two, and as the two sisters had one name, it might happen, owing to particular circumstances, that some of the sons on both sides should bear the same name.

But from what has been said, it by no means follows, that the James who is distinguished in the New Testament as a brother of the Lord, was one of these brethren of Christ in a stricter sense. It might still be consistent with that fact, that this James was to be distinguished from the James who was the actual brother of the Lord, and, as a cousin of Christ who was honored with this name, was to be held as identical with the apostle, although in this case it is less probable that when an actual brother of Jesus bore the name of James, the cousin should be honored with the same title, instead of being distinguished by the epithet "cousin" from that other James, to whom the surname of brother of the Lord would in strictest propriety be given.

If we are disposed to examine more closely the passages in the Pauline epistles which contain a particular reference to this point, there are two especially deserving of notice. As to the passage in 1 Cor. ix. 5, "as well as other apostles and the brethren of the Lord," ὡς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ κυρίου, it cannot be proved from these words that the brethren of the Lord were distinct from the apostles, for they may be supposed to mean, that Paul, by *the other apostles*, understood those who could not claim such a relationship to the Lord, and that he particularly distinguishes those who were brethren of the Lord from the other apostles, because, in virtue of that relationship, they stood high in the opinion of the party with whom he had here to do. That he specially names Peter immediately after, rather favors the notion that the brethren of the Lord, as well as Peter, belong to the number of the apostles. Yet this is not a decisive proof, for it would surely be possible that, although the brethren of the Lord did not belong to the apostles, Paul might mention them in this connexion, because they, or some of them, were held in equal estimation by the Jewish Christians of Palestine; and as, along with them, Peter was most highly respected, he is particularly mentioned at the same time. It is indeed possible, that Paul here uses the term "apostle," not in the strictest sense, but in a wider meaning, as in Rom. xvi. 7; and so much the more, since he immediately afterwards mentions Barnabas, to whom the name of an apostle could be applied only in that more general acceptation of the term. The second important passage is Gal. i. 19, where Paul, after speaking of his conference with the apostle Peter at Jerusalem, adds, that he had seen no other of the apostles, "save James the Lord's brother." Yet, from this passage, it cannot be so certainly inferred as Dr. Schneckenburger thinks, that the James here named was one of the apostles. The state of the case may be conceived to have been thus: Paul had originally in his thoughts only a negative position, he had seen no other apostle than Peter at Jerusalem. But as it afterwards occurred to him, that he had seen at Jerusalem James the brother of the Lord, who, though no apostle, was held in apostolic estimation by the Judaizers, on this account he added, by way of limitation, a reference to James.

whole is, that this James was one of the brethren of Christ, of whom we have spoken in our *Life of Christ*, p. 29. Thus it appears how

We must therefore suppose that with the use of the word "save," *εἰ μὴ*, the idea of "apostle" extended itself so as to include one who was only related to the apostolic office. It may, moreover, be asked whether Paul would have expressed himself in this manner, if he had reckoned James in the stricter sense among the apostles? Should we not expect in this case that, instead of first expressing so universal a negation in order immediately after to qualify it, he would have said from the beginning that he saw no other apostles than those two, who also seemed to be pillars in the church? When Schneckenburger, from the words in Acts ix. 27, infers that Paul must at that time have conferred with at least two apostles at Jerusalem, he attaches greater weight than can be allowed with certainty to single expressions in this short narrative.

Yet, if we compare on this point the oldest ecclesiastical tradition—the account in the gospel of the Hebrews (see Hieronym. de V. I. c. ii.)—with 1 Cor. xv. 7, it will appear to favor the identity of the one James; for in that gospel it is said that Christ, after his resurrection, appeared to James the Just, the brother of the Lord. But in the passage in the Epistle to the Corinthians, the same James seems to be mentioned as one of the twelve apostles. Still we find here nothing absolutely certain, for it cannot be shown that the reference in that gospel is to the *same* appearance of Christ as in the epistle. And if it be assumed that James, the brother of the Lord, was then held in so great esteem, that, when this name was mentioned, only one individual would be generally thought of, it is not perfectly clear, from his being brought forward in this connexion, that he was reckoned by Paul among the apostles. Then there is the tradition of Hegesippus, in Euseb. ii. 23, which is to be taken into account. When he says that James, the brother of the Lord, undertook *with the apostles*, *μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων*, the guidance of the church at Jerusalem, it is most natural to suppose that he means to distinguish James from the apostles, otherwise he would have said *with the others*, *μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν*, although we would not consider the other interpretation as impossible, especially in writers of this class, in whom we do not look for great precision in their mode of expression. Also, the whole narrative of Hegesippus leads us to believe, that he considered James as distinct from the apostles; for, although his representation carries in it, at all events, marks of internal improbability, yet it would not appear altogether irrational, on the supposition that this James was an apostle appointed by Christ himself. But we must compare with this passage the words of Hegesippus in Euseb. iv. 22: *μετὰ τὸ μαρτυρῆσαι Ἰάκωβον τὸν δίκαιον, ὡς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ, πάλιν ὁ ἐκ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ Συμεὼν ὁ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ καθίσταται ἐπίσκοπος· ὃν προέθεντο πάντες, ὄντα ἀνεψιὸν τοῦ κυρίου δεύτερον*, (after James, the Just, had suffered martyrdom, as did the Lord for the same cause, Simeon, a son of Cleopas, James' uncle, was appointed bishop, whom all had proposed for the office, being the second cousin of the Lord.) If we understand by these words, that this Simeon was called the second nephew in relation to the afore-mentioned James the Just, as the first nephew of the Lord, it would follow that that James, as a nephew of the Lord, is called his brother. Yet, if another interpretation is possible, according to which Hegesippus agrees with himself in reference to the words before quoted, such an interpretation must be readily preferred. And this interpretation is that which agrees best with the words in their existing position. For, since James is the principal subject in the first half of the sentence, the "his," *αὐτοῦ*, must be referred to him. Cleopas, accordingly, is called the uncle of James, and his son Simeon cannot therefore be the brother of James, but is his cousin; and as Cleopas (— Alpheus) is the uncle of Jesus, (and, according to Hegesippus in Euseb. iii. 11, on the side of Joseph as well as of Mary,) Simeon is the cousin of Jesus and the cousin of James, which again favors the opinion that the last two were brothers. But Hegesippus might call this Simeon a second nephew, since he looked upon the apostle James, the son of Alpheus, who was no longer living, as the first nephew. We might also insert a stop after *κυρίου*, and connect *δεύτερον* with *προέθεντο*; by this

very much the course of his religious development was distinguished from that of the apostle Paul. The latter, during the life of Christ on earth, was at a distance from all personal outward communication with him, and learnt to know him first by spiritual communion. James, on the contrary, stood in the closest family relation to the Redeemer, and from the first was present with him during the whole of his earthly development; but it was exactly this circumstance which contributed to his being more slow to recognise in the son of man, the Son of God; and while he clung only to the earthly appearance, he was prevented from penetrating through the shell to the substance. Paul, by a violent crisis, made the transition from the most vehement and unsparing opposition to the gospel, to the most zealous advocacy of it. James gradually advanced from Judaism, which he held with great earnestness and depth, and to which he added a faith in Jesus as the Messiah that constantly became more decisive, to Christianity as the glorification and fulfilling of the law.

There may be some truth at bottom in what is narrated by the Christian historian Hegesippus, that this James led from childhood the life of a Nazarene. If we consider what an impression the appearances at and after the birth of Christ, and the conviction that the first-born son of Mary was destined to be the Messiah, must have left on the minds of his parents, it may be easily explained how they felt themselves compelled to dedicate their first-born son James,* to the service of Jehovah in strict abstinence for the whole of his life. To this also it might be owing, that the freer mode of life which Christ adopted with his disciples was less congenial to him; and with his strict, legal, Jewish convictions he could not comprehend the new spirit which revealed itself in Christ's words; many of these must have appeared to him as "hard sayings." Proceeding from the common Jewish views, he expected that Jesus, if he were the Messiah, would verify himself to be such in the presence of the people by a sign that would compel the universal recognition of his claims, by the establishment of a visible kingdom in earthly glory. By the impression of Christ's ministry he became indeed excited to believe, but the power of early habit and prejudice always counteracted that impression, and he found himself in a state of indecision from which he could not at once free himself. Only half a year before the last sufferings of Christ we find him in this vacillating condition, for John does not in this respect distinguish him from the other brethren of Jesus, who certainly were thus in doubt; John vii. 5. But after the ascension

construction, mention would be made of only one cousin of the Lord, as the successor of his brother, as the second overseer of the church. But the position of the words is very much against this construction. Certainly, the testimony of Hegesippus must have great weight, on account of his high antiquity, his descent, and his connexion with the Jewish Christians of Palestine. But it is undeniable, if we compare the two passages from the Hypotyposes of Clement, quoted by Eusebius, ii. 1, that he distinguishes James, who bore the surname of the Just, as an apostle in the stricter sense of the word.

* His being described by the appellation of the son, indicates that he was the eldest.

of Christ, he appears as a decided and zealous member of the company of disciples; Acts i. 13. This leads us to suppose that the resurrection of Christ was the transition point with him, from a vacillating to a fixed and unshaken faith. We see how important the Saviour deemed it to produce such a faith in him, by his honoring him with a special appearance after the resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 7), whether this was occasioned or not, by his having expressed doubts like Thomas.* This James obtained constantly increasing respect in the church at Jerusalem.

Every feature of his character which we can gather from the Acts, from Josephus,† and from the traditions of Hegesippus in Eusebius,‡ well agrees with the image of him presented in the epistle that bears his name. By his strict, pious life, which agreed with the Jewish notions of legal piety, he won the universal veneration, not only of the believers among the Jews, but also of the better disposed among his countrymen generally; on this account he was distinguished by the surname of the Just, *יֵשׁוּעַ הַדָּיָק*, *δίκαιος*; and, if we may credit the account of Hegesippus, he was viewed as men of distinguished and commanding excellence are viewed in times of corruption and ruin, and hence was termed the bulwark of the people.§ According to the representations of this writer, he must have lived after the manner of the strictest ascetics among the Jews. The consecration of his childhood had already introduced him to such a mode of life, and we might suppose that he had already won by it peculiar respect among the Jews, if on that supposition it were not surprising that no trace can be found of it in the Gospels, no marks of special distinction awarded to him by his brethren. At all events, he might afterwards avail himself of this ascetic strictness as a means of attracting the attention of the multitude to his person, and thereby to the doctrine he published. This mode of life considered in itself, provided its value was not rated too high, was by no means unchristian. What Hegesippus narrates of him perfectly suits his character, that he frequently prostrated himself on his knees in the temple, calling upon God

* The narrative in the Gospel of the Hebrews (see Life of Christ, p. 432) is not an authority of sufficient credit for us to venture to follow it here. It tells us that James, after partaking of the Last Supper with Christ, made a vow that he would not again taste food till he had seen him risen from the dead; that Christ appeared to him as the Risen One, and said, "Now eat thy bread, for the Son of Man is risen from the dead." We must certainly consider how important it was for the hesitating and doubting James, who afterwards knew so well how to describe the unhappiness of such a state (i. 6), to attain to the certainty on this subject, which such an occurrence would give him, and which such a vow led him to expect. But not only is the work of the Jewish Christian, who bestowed so much pains in embellishing the history of James, not a credible source of information in itself, but there is also a palpable contradiction in the chronology of the history of the resurrection, between this narrative and Paul's account.

† Joseph. Archæol. xx. 9.

‡ Hist. Eccles. ii. 23.

§ Perhaps *יֵשׁוּעַ הַדָּיָק* or *יֵשׁוּעַ הַבָּרִי*, which comes nearer the phraseology of Hegesippus, unless, which is indeed less probable, we read, with Fuller, *יֵשׁוּעַ הַבָּרִי*, which Hegesippus translates "bulwark of the people," *περιοχὴ τοῦ λαοῦ*.

to forgive the sins of his people, (probably having a special reference to the forgiveness of their sins against the Messiah,)—that the divine judgments on the unbelievers might be averted,—and that they might be led to repentance and faith, and thus to a participation in the kingdom of the glorified Messiah.

But some important doubts may be raised against the credibility of this account of Hegesippus, taken in its full extent. His whole narrative contains much fiction, and bears the stamp of the Ebionitish mode of thinking to which he was probably given. That Ebionite party among whom an ascetic, theosophic tendency prevailed, and who circulated apocryphal writings under the name of James, had probably formed an ideal conception of his character in harmony with their own peculiarities, and Hegesippus might mistake the image delineated in their traditions for an historical reality. The Epistle of James by no means bears decided marks of such a tendency, for everything which has been supposed to be of this kind may very properly be referred to the simple Christian renunciation of the world, such as has its seat in the disposition. If the Jewish love of gain is here spoken against, if the earthly-mindedness of the rich, the homage paid to this class and the contempt of the poor are condemned, and it is declared to be precisely among the poor that the gospel has found the most ready entrance, exalting them to the highest dignity, yet it by no means follows, that the author of this epistle entirely condemned, like the Ebionites, all possession whatever of earthly goods.

This Epistle is especially important, not only for illustrating the character of James, but also for giving us an insight into the state of the Christian churches which were formed from Judaism, and were unmixed with Christians of Gentile descent. According to an opinion very generally prevalent from ancient times, we should be led to believe that the peculiar doctrinal system of the apostle Paul had already been formed and disseminated when this epistle was written, and that those churches particularly to whom it was addressed, had been affected by the influence of this Pauline system. The opinion we refer to is, that James in this epistle either combated the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith in and for itself, or a misunderstanding, and an erroneous application, of it. We can, certainly, well imagine, that James, who had advanced in gradual development from the law to the gospel as the fulfilling of the law—who, retaining his Jewish convictions, by faith in Jesus as the Lord and Saviour, the Author of the new divine life, continually spiritualized and glorified these convictions more and more,—might from such a course of development, misunderstand the Pauline type of doctrine which had been formed under a wholly opposite course of development. We can suppose, that when he met such a mode of expression, he might feel it his duty to combat it, since practically injurious consequences appeared to flow from it. We can suppose that he knew not how to separate the correct understanding and the misunderstanding from one another, since to him the whole mode of contemplating the subject was quite foreign.

Thus James might have combated Paul, though both were bound together by the Spirit of Christ.

And it would not be difficult to support this opinion by many single passages in the epistle taken alone, without a reference to their connexion with the whole;* for it seems as if the express reference to the Pauline formula of the justification to be obtained by faith alone, and to which works can contribute nothing, could not be mistaken; especially as the same examples of faith as those mentioned by Paul, namely those of Abraham and Sarah, are adduced. But this opinion, though plausible at first sight, if we examine more closely the relation of particular passages to the whole tenor of the epistle, will soon appear untenable. The error in reference to faith which James combats in this epistle, is certainly not one altogether isolated; but it appears as a single offset proceeding with many others from the root of one false principle; and this principle is quite distinct from that which would admit of an application, whether correct or incorrect, of the Pauline doctrine. It was the tendency of the Jewish spirit, mistaking the life of religion as seated in the disposition, everywhere taking up the mere dead form, the appearance, instead of the reality, in religion—the same tendency, which substituted a lifeless, arrogant acquaintance with the letter for the genuine wisdom inseparable from the divine life—which prided itself in an inoperative knowledge of the law, without paying any attention to the practice of the law—which placed devotion in outward ceremonies, and neglected that devotion which shows itself in works of love—which contented itself with the verbal expression of love, instead of proving it by works; it was the same tendency of the Jewish mind estranged from the spirit and life of religion, which, as it laid an undue value on the *opus operatum* of outward religious acts, so also on the *opus operatum* of a faith in the one Jehovah and in the Messiah, which left the disposition unchanged,† and which presumed that by such a faith, the Jew was suf-

* We wish to remark, in passing, that among those who have thought that they have detected a contradiction between James and Paul in the doctrine of justification, is the celebrated patriarch Cyrillus Lucaris, of Constantinople, who was led to this opinion by reading the epistle. It also struck him that the name of Christ is scarcely mentioned above once or twice, and then coldly (*anzi del nome di Jesu Christo a pena fa mentione una o due volte e freddamente*); that the mysteries of the incarnation of the Son of God and of redemption are not treated of, but only morality (*solo a la moralita attende*); see Letter vii. in *Lettres Anecdotes de Cyrille Lucar*. Amsterdam, 1718, p. 85.

† Baur's authoritative decision (p. 686) "that this is a perfectly untenable, self-contradictory, idea," cannot at all move me. That the idea of the *opus operatum*, according to the original and common meaning of the phrase, can only denote something outward, I am well aware; but a word may be used in a sense besides the common,—in an exceptional and metaphorical sense. So I have used the word here, which I was perfectly justified in doing, to denote a superficial opinion, which remains as something wholly external to the soul, and is not a matter of the disposition or the heart. Now it is the same externalising of religion, which places its essence, either in ceremonial observances, or in such a faith. Both spring from the same root. The proofs he adduces in Note I. on p. 567, only serve to confirm my assertion. Certainly there was also among the Jews a false theory, which

ficiently distinguished from the sinful race of the Gentiles, and was justified before God, even though the conduct of the life was in contradiction to the requirements of faith. Thus we find here one branch of that practical, fundamental error which chiefly prevailed among these Jewish Christians, whom James combats in the whole of the epistle, even where faith is not the immediate subject of discourse. It was the erroneous tendency which belonged to those tendencies that commonly prevailed among the great mass of the Jews, and which had found its way also among those Christians in whose minds the gospel had not effected a complete transformation, but whose Jewish spirit had only connected itself with faith in Jesus as the Messiah.* (See above, p. 22, and my Church History, vol. i. p. 52.)

But as to the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith, whether correctly or incorrectly understood and applied, we cannot suppose its influence to be possible in churches of this class, and hence that James, with the object which he had in view, should argue against it, is utterly inconceivable.† As the superscription and contents of his epistle inform us, it was manifestly addressed only to churches that were composed

attributed an unfounded value to a dead faith in the one God in opposition to idolatry, and made this a support of moral inactivity. This Jewish notion of faith need only be applied to the new object, Jesus the Messiah. But that a person expressing his opposition to a certain tendency, should thereby be induced so to express himself as if he meant another tendency which agrees only accidentally with this in the mode of expression—of that we do not here find the only example in history.

* That Jewish mode of thinking which Justin Martyr describes in *Dial. c. Tryph. Jud.* fol. 370, ed. Colon.—ὥς ὑμεῖς ἀπατάτε ἑαυτοὺς καὶ ἄλλοι τινὲς ὑμῖν ὅμοιοι κατὰ τοῦτο (in this respect Jewish-minded Christians), οἱ λέγουσιν, ὅτι καὶν ἁμαρτωλοὶ ὦσι, θεὸν δὲ γινώσκουσιν, οὐ μὴ λογίσηται αὐτοῖς κύριος ἁμαρτίαν, (as you, and others like to you in this respect, deceive yourselves when you say that though you may be sinners, yet knowing God, the Lord will not impute to you sin.) That mode of thinking which is found in the Clementine homilies, according to which, faith in one God (τό τῆς μοναρχίας καλὸν) has such great magical power, that the ψυχὴ μοναρχικῇ, even while living in vice, had this advantage over idolaters, that it could not perish, but through purifying punishments would at last attain to salvation. See Hom. iii. c. 6. This was the idea of faith, which, from an entirely different source than from a misunderstanding of Paul, found entrance afterwards among Christians themselves, and to which a Marcion directly opposed the Pauline idea of faith. Against such perversions Paul warned the churches, both by word of mouth and in writing, when he so impressively charged it upon them that their renunciation of heathenism was nugatory, and could not contribute to their participation in the kingdom of God, if they did not renounce their former sinful life. See Gal. v. 21. The "vain words," κενοὶ λόγοι, against which he warns the Ephesians, v. 6.

† Dr. Kern, in his essay on the Origin of the Epistle of James, in the Tübingen *Zeitschrift für Theologie*, 1835, p. 25, on account of what is here asserted, charges me with a *petitio principii*; but I cannot perceive with any justice. This charge could only be brought against me if I had assumed, *without evidence*, that this epistle was addressed to an unmixed church; or if I had passed altogether unnoticed the possible case which Kern considers as the actual (though he himself has abandoned it lately in the Introduction to his Commentary on this Epistle), that it was forged by a Jewish Christian in James's name, in order to controvert the Pauline doctrinal views which prevailed among the Gentile churches.

entirely of Jewish Christians. But such persons were least of all disposed to attach themselves particularly to Paul, and least of all disposed and fitted to agree to the Pauline doctrine, which presented the most direct opposition to their customary mode of thinking. It was precisely from persons of this stamp that the intemperate, fanatical outcry was raised against this form of Christian doctrine, as if by depending on grace, men were made secure in sin, or that they were justified in doing evil that good might come, Rom. iii. 8. In an entirely different quarter, from an Hellenic (gnostic) Antinomianism, which was also Anti-Judaism, arose at a later period an erroneous, practically destructive appropriation and application of the Pauline doctrine of justification, such as Paul himself thought it needful to guard against by anticipation; Rom. vi. 1; Gal. v. 13. And this later erroneous application of the idea of faith, which tended likewise to the injury of practical Christianity, proceeded from an entirely different exposition of this idea than that presented by the one-sided direction of the Jewish spirit. It manifested itself rather as an Oriental Hellenic, than as a Jewish, spirit; it was not the abstract idea of faith, but a one-sided contemplative, or idealising, tendency, which deviated from the conception of faith as an animating principle of the will and a practical determination of the life.

We do not wish to deny that even in churches composed of Jewish Christians, and of Jewish-Christian views, there might be individuals who had been influenced by the Pauline doctrine; and we grant it as possible, that James, by what he had heard of the expressions of individuals who had been thus influenced, had been induced to combat such a tendency in his epistle. And we should be disposed thus to account for the origin of the epistle, if it could be proved that it was directed against various theoretical and practical errors springing out of different roots. But this was not the case. It is evident from what has been said, that all the evil which is combated in this epistle must be referred to one root, that of the common Jewish spirit which had received into itself the belief in Jesus as the Messiah. Hence we shall be induced, if it be possible, to regard the individual error, not as something isolated, as we should be obliged to do if we deduced it from the Pauline element, but rather as connected with that common fundamental tendency.

But further, we must here consider the position of James in relation to Paul. If we believed ourselves justified in admitting an open contrariety between them, we might suppose that James, in consequence of his peculiar course of development, was incapable of entering into the peculiar Pauline form of doctrine, and had combated it through his own misconception of it, or as a misconception of others that stood opposed to him. But we have shown that we can by no means be led to presuppose such a hostile relation between James and Paul, although there was a party named after the former apostle, who set themselves in opposition to Paul, as indeed there was a Pauline party, who formed themselves into an opposition not sanctioned by Paul himself. According to this suppo-

sition we cannot admit that James combated either the doctrine of Paul itself, or a misunderstood version and application of it, without, at the same time, distinguishing the correct view of it, and guarding himself against the appearance of contradicting the Apostle Paul, especially since this appearance might so easily arise among Jewish-Christian churches; or else we should be obliged to suppose that James had controverted that dogmatic phraseology without being aware of its connexion with Paul's system, which we cannot consider as in the least degree probable.

Thus far we have taken for granted that this epistle was the production of him who names himself in it as its author. But very recently this has been disputed both on external and internal grounds.* Several weighty authorities have favored the opinion that the epistle was forged in James's name, in order to promote a certain class of religious opinions.† The design might have been to controvert the Pauline doctrine of Justification, to set the authority of James against Paul, and this design might well suit the one-sided tendency of a Jewish Christian. But such a person would not only have expressed himself in a more decided manner than that James, of whose reputation he wished to avail himself; but he would have pointed out by name the individual, Paul, against whom he directed his attack, and would have expressed in stronger terms, his opposition to his doctrine. The subordinate place which in this case the controversy with the Pauline doctrine occupies in relation to the whole of the epistle, certainly does not agree with this hypothesis.

* The external grounds against the genuineness of this epistle, though the Peschito is in favor of it, would have greater weight, if the doubts that arose in the first centuries as to acknowledging it, might not be so easily explained from its spreading among Jewish-Christian churches (a circumstance suited to excite in many minds a prejudice against it) an argument against Paul's doctrine which it was believed to contain; to which must be added the indistinct designation of the author at the beginning of the epistle.

† We are willing to submit to the charge of narrow-mindedness in declaring ourselves against the assertion so unceremoniously made and so often repeated, that such a literary fiction could have been nothing offensive to the principles of the earlier Christian period. We have no reason for supposing that any one, after the manner of the rhetoricians, would have said by another what he could himself in some way have said, or that he would attribute to another what he wished specially to impress on the minds of his contemporaries. Such fictions must ever have been intended to deceive; they were designed to facilitate the admission of what was said by the appropriated authority of another. There was a so-called *pious fraud*, a manifest lie, which could find its justification in the design of spreading certain truths. There was doubtless a peculiar view to which such a principle answered; but that the principle generally prevailed appears to me an arbitrary assumption. We ought carefully to guard against supposing that to have generally prevailed which was only a peculiarity of individual tendencies of spirit. There was a one-sided, theoretic, speculative spirit from which lax principles respecting veracity proceeded, as we have remarked in Plato. It was closely connected with that aristocraticism of antiquity, first overturned by the power of the gospel, which treated the mass of the people as unsusceptible of pure truth in religion, and hence justified the use of falsehood to serve as leading-strings for the *multitude*, πολλοί. As the reaction of earlier conceptions, we find this view in parties of kindred tendencies, such as the Alexandrian Jews, the Gnostics, the Platonising Alexan-

Others are disposed to find in this epistle a refined Ebionitism,* in which the Jewish element had lost much of its original coarseness, although the practical basis which distinguished its view from the Pauline, remained the same. The origination of the epistle at a later period is supposed to be indicated by the influences which the Pauline spirit had already exerted on the elements that were opposed to it. Thus the softened Judaism, which could not altogether escape the influence of the Pauline ideas, must contain the certain mark of a later, more advanced Christian development. In our inquiries on this subject, all depends on how we view the relation of Christ to the developing process of Christianity. If persons regard Christ only as the individual who gave the impulse to a new development, which, through a Paul, and the spirit exhibited in the Gospel of John, was carried forward beyond his personal efforts, to them such a view may commend itself. And so James may appear as the rigid Ebionite, who could not possibly have written such an epistle, and so it may appear necessary to invent such an intermediate step for the Ebionitism, softened and spiritualized by the progressive influence of the movement set a-going by Paul. To us the relation of Christ to Christianity appears altogether different, since we must regard the revelation through Christ as the original and perfect one, from which the whole developing process of the apostolic doctrine is to be derived. We shall refer the elements akin to the Pauline doctrine in James, not to Paul, but to the same original source from which Paul derived them, that is, to Christ himself. The fulfilment of the law in the gospel, which is exhibited in the Sermon on the Mount, reappears in the conception of Christianity peculiar to James, and we cannot fail to notice several correspondences with the sayings of Christ. Although James and Paul are representatives of the two opposite extremes in the development of the Christian doctrine, yet in virtue of their common relation to the original source of revelation in Christ, a relationship to one another and a higher unity must result between them. If we know the real Christ, we shall not be disposed to believe that James, who had received unto himself the whole personal impression of the Saviour, could retain the common Jewish narrow-mindedness. As we find in his epistle that image of James which all the historical data would lead us to frame, so, on the other hand, no trace is to be found in it of its being composed in post-apostolic times,—nothing, especially, which points to a later form of Ebionitism. The manner, also, in which the nearness of Christ's second advent is

drian fathers. But from the first, a sounder practical Christian spirit combated this error, as we see in the instances of Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Tertullian. The anti-gnostic tendency was also zealous for strict veracity. Now a similar practical tendency distinguishes this epistle, in which I can nowhere find an Ebionitish anti-Pauline point of view. This spirit of strict veracity is shown in what is said respecting swearing. The epistle, indeed, wears altogether a different character from the Clementines, which show a very decided party tendency and party bias.

* The view developed by Baur and Schweigler.

spoken of, suits best the apostolic age. Had the epistle been forged in favor of any of the party interests of the day, we should have met with references to the manifold contrarieties of Christian development then existing, as, for instance, those of the Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians, the Paulinian and anti-Paulinian systems. But no one, except he belongs to the class who can find everything everywhere, can detect in this epistle any of all these and similar references to the contrarieties of that age, excepting only the possible allusion to the Pauline doctrine of faith. But even then, we could hardly expect that the anti-Pauline tendencies of the second century would shew themselves so feebly as they do, and in a way so unlike that of the Clementines in which they everywhere prevail.

But is this allusion really so very evident? Let us recollect that the Pauline phraseology formed itself from Judaism, from the Jewish-Greek diction—that it by no means created purely new modes of expression,* but often only appropriated the ancient Jewish terms, employed them in new combinations, applied them to new contrasts, and animated them with a new spirit. Thus neither the term “justification” in reference to God, nor the term “faith,” was entirely new; but both these terms and the ideas indicated by them (and indeed, in reference to the first, the same idea the existence of which among the Jews Paul must have assumed in arguing with his Jewish opponents) had been long familiar to the Jews. The example likewise of Abraham as a hero in faith must have been obvious to every Jew, and the example of Rahab (which is adduced only in the Epistle to the Hebrews—an epistle neither composed by Paul nor containing the peculiarly Pauline doctrinal statement of justifying faith), since it proved the benefit of the monotheistic faith to a Gentile of impure life, must have especially commended itself to the Jews who were disposed to extol the importance of faith in Jehovah.†

Let us now look in the Epistle itself for the marks of the time in which it was written, and of the churches to which it was addressed. It is remarkable that, according to its superscription, it is addressed only to the Jews of the twelve tribes who lived in the dispersion, and yet it is manifestly addressed to Christians. Still this may be very well explained if we consider the view of James, such as it is shown to be by the whole of the epistle. He considers the acknowledgment of the Messiahship of Jesus as essentially belonging to genuine Judaism, believers in Jesus as the only genuine Jews, Christianity as perfected Judaism, by

* On the manner in which Paul employed phrases which were already in use among Jewish theologians, compare Dr. Roeth's work, *De Epistola ad Hebræos*, p. 121, &c., though I cannot agree with the author in what he attempts to prove; for in the use which Paul makes of an existing form of dogmatic expression, he forms the most decided contrast to the Jewish meaning. But it appears from this, how James, proceeding from the Jewish point of view, without any reference to the Pauline doctrine, would be led to the choice of such expressions.

† Thus it appears to me that what Dr. De Wette says in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1830, p. 349, in order to point out an intentional opposition of James to Paul, is nullified.

which the Law had attained its completion. And it is not impossible that, although he addressed himself especially to Christians, he also had in his thoughts the Jewish readers into whose hands the epistle might fall, as Christians lived among the Jews without any marked separation. From the mention of their descent from the twelve tribes, we may infer that these churches consisted purely of Jewish Christians, or that James, who considered himself peculiarly the apostle of the Jews, addressed only the Jewish part of the church. Yet as no notice is taken of the relation of Jewish to Gentile Christians, it is by far the most probable opinion that these churches consisted entirely of the former. Partly from the peculiar views of James, and partly from the peculiar situation of these churches which had retained all the Jewish forms, we may account for the use of the ancient Jewish name "synagogue," *συναγωγή*, instead of the peculiar Christian term "church," *ἐκκλησία*, as the designation of the meeting of the community of believers.* Such churches might exist during the later apostolic age in the inland parts of Asia, perhaps in Syria. But if the epistle was addressed to churches in these parts, it appears strange that James, to whom the Aramaic must have been much more familiar than the Greek, (although it was not impossible that he had so far learnt the Greek as to be able to write an epistle in it,†) should have made use of the latter language. We must therefore conclude, that this point was determined by a regard to the wants of his readers, and that part of them at least belonged to the Hellenists. This being assumed, we must fix the date of the epistle at a time preceding the separate formation of Gentile Christian churches, before the relation of Gentiles and Jews to one another in the Christian church had been brought under discussion,‡ the period of the first spread of Christianity in Syria, Cilicia, and the adjacent regions.§

These churches consisted for the most part of the poor,|| (though

* Our knowledge of the spread of Christianity at this period, is indeed far too defective to dogmatise with Kern on this point.

† It is possible also that some one served him as interpreter.

‡ The view which Dr. Schneckenburger has acutely developed, and defended in his valuable *Beiträge zur Einleitung in's Neue Testament*, Stuttgart, 1832, and in his *Annotatio ad Epistolam Jacobi*. He has expressed his agreement, respecting the object of the polemical portion of this epistle, with the views I have developed in this work, and in my earlier occasional writings. See his Essays on this subject in Steudel's *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*, 1829 and 1830, part ii.

§ An allusion to the use of the name "Christians" has been erroneously supposed in James ii. 7, and hence an attempt to fix the date of the epistle. By "worthy name," *καλὸν ὄνομα*, we may most probably understand the name of Jesus, and this is the simplest explanation, since the words will be most naturally applied to the invocation of the name of Jesus as the Messiah, to whom believers were consecrated at baptism, the baptism "into the name of Jesus," *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*. See Schneckenburger's Commentary on the passage.

|| According to the views which Kern formerly presented, the author of this epistle, in an Ebionitish manner, marked the genuine Christians, that is, in his opinion the Jewish Christians, as the poor, and the Gentile Christians as the rich, whom he would not so

some individuals among them were rich,)* and they were in various ways oppressed by the wealthy and prominent Jews.† Certainly these churches were so constituted, that, in many cases, their Christianity consisted only in the acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messiah, and of single moral precepts of his, which they considered as the perfecting of the law. Since they were far from recognising and appropriating the real essence of Christianity, they resembled the great mass of the Jewish nation, in the predominance of a carnal mind, and the prevalence of worldly lusts, contention, and zealotism. Accordingly, we must either assume that Christianity among them was still novel, and had not yet penetrated the life, as from the beginning (see above, p. 22), there were many among the Jews, who, carried away by the impression which the extraordinary operations of the apostles had made upon them, and attracted by the hope that Jesus would soon return, and establish his kingdom on earth, the happiness of which they depicted agreeably to their own inclinations, in such a state of mind and with such expectations, made a profession of Christianity, without having experienced any essential change of character—or we must suppose, that these churches had sunk into a state of degeneracy from higher attainments in the Christian life. In the constitution of these churches there was this peculiarity, that as the direction of the office of teaching had not been committed to the presbyters, but only the outward management of church affairs, many members of the community came forward as teachers, while, as yet, there was no special office of teacher; (see above, pp. 34, 145.) Hence James deemed it needful to admonish them, that too many ought not to obtrude themselves as teachers; that none ought too inconsiderately to take up speaking in their public meetings, but that each should

knowledge to be genuine Christians. But the condition of the Christian churches among the Gentiles generally in the first age, certainly will not allow us to suppose, that it would occur to any one to impose this name upon them, and in every point of view this supposition appears to be entirely groundless.

* James i. 10.

† The passage in James ii. 7, is referred most naturally to the blaspheming of Jesus by the enemies of Christianity, although the immediately preceding context relates not to religious persecutions, but to oppressions and extortions of a different kind. Compare v. 4. It is by no means evident, that by the "rich" in this epistle we are always to understand the same members of the Christian community. The author may refer partly to the rich among the Jews, who were averse to Christianity, partly to the rich among the Christians, who formed a very small minority. From the contrast in i. 9, 10, it by no means follows that by the rich in the latter verse only Christians are intended. By those of low degree who were to rejoice in being exalted, he could indeed mean only Christians; but among the rich, he might include those wealthy Jews, who by their entire devotedness to earthly objects were prevented from becoming Christians. These persons should learn the nothingness of earthly possessions, which they had hitherto made their highest good, should humble themselves, and in this self-humiliation find their true glory; for with the nothingness of earthly things they would learn the truly highest good,—the true dignity or elevation imparted by the Messiah. The directions thus given were equivalent to a summons to become Christians.

recollect the responsibility he incurred by such a procedure; James i. 19; iii. 1, 2.

As to the doctrine of James and the mode of its exhibition in this epistle, we find nothing whatever which stands in contradiction to the more fully developed doctrine of the New Testament, as we shall show when we come to treat of doctrine; and the Christian ideas actually presented in this epistle point to the organic connection of the whole Christian system. But the contents of these Christian ideas are not evolved and applied to particulars; what is purely Christian is more insulated; reference to Christ is not so predominant and all-penetrating as in the other epistles. Reference to the Old Testament, though conjoined with Christian views, predominates. For the explanation of this phenomenon, to allege the peculiar views of the persons addressed is not sufficient, for a Paul, a John, or a Peter would certainly have written to them in a very different strain; we must rather seek the explanation in the peculiar character of the writer himself. We might hence infer (with Schneckenburger) that James wrote this epistle at a time when Christianity had not thoroughly penetrated his spiritual life, during the earliest period of his Christian development; but it may be questioned whether we are justified in drawing such a conclusion, for no proof can be given that he enlarged his doctrinal views at a later period. It is possible that he remained confined in this imperfect form of doctrinal development, although his heart was penetrated by love to God and to Jesus the Messiah. He still maintained the character which belonged to him from his individual position as a teacher of the Jews, as the guide of his countrymen in passing over from the Old to the New Testament. True it is, that much would be wanting to the church for the completeness of Christian knowledge, if the statement of Christian doctrine by James did not find its complement in the representations of the other apostles; but in connexion with their teachings it forms an important contribution to the entire conception and development of Christian truth, and furnishes all that can be expected from one occupying such a position.*

* As the ultra-Paulinism of the second century stood quite aloof from James, so in the hostility shown to the Epistle of James we recognise the one-sidedness of the Lutheran element. Although the Epistle of James occupies a subordinate place in the development of Christian truth, compared with the Pauline epistles, yet it is important for checking many a one-sided exaggeration to which the Pauline element, if made unduly prominent, might be carried. Thus its position in the Canon has a peculiar propriety. Its importance in a practical view is beautifully exhibited by the excellent THOMAS ARNOLD in the volume of his Sermons entitled *Christian Life, its Hopes, its Fears, and its Close*, Sermon IV., on Christian Conviction, p. 51:—"But for those who complain that no preaching but that of the very gospel itself is becoming a Christian minister, or useful to Christian people, I would refer them for an answer not only to some of the books of the Old Testament, which, on their notion, we might almost strike out of our Bibles, but to a complete portion of the New Testament itself—to the Epistle of St. James, the Lord's brother. That epistle undoubtedly supposes that they who were to read it had received other teaching beforehand; that the gospel in the strict sense had been already preached to them. But in itself it does not in that high sense preach the gospel; it dwells rather from beginning to

It was exactly this form of doctrine that secured for James a long and undisturbed ministration among the Jews, and many were led by his influence to faith in Christ; but this excited so much the more the hatred of the basest among the party-leaders of the Jewish people, who sought for an opportunity to sacrifice him to their rage. One of the most impetuous among them, the high priest Ananus, who was disposed to all the violent acts of party hatred, availed himself for this purpose of the interval between the departure of the Roman procurator Felix, and the arrival of his successor Albinus, about the year 62. He caused James, with some other Christians, to be condemned to death by the Sanhedrim, as a violator of the law, and he was stoned.* But the better disposed

end on such points of Christian duty as are required to perfect the man of God unto all good works, points which may be called properly moral. Now that some Christian preaching, in particular circumstances, should follow the model of St. James's Epistle, appears to me no just matter of blame. But as St. James's Epistle is in the New Testament only one out of many, and as he himself must often and earnestly have preached the gospel in the more strict sense, although he did not do it in this one epistle, so should we, both preachers and hearers, greatly deceive and hurt ourselves if we forget that the proper preaching of the gospel and the believing it is our one great business, without which, and except as founded upon it and taking the knowledge and belief of it for granted, all other preaching is to Christians worse than unprofitable, not edifying their souls, but rather subverting them." (See also Dr. Arnold's *Sermons on the Interpretation of Scripture*, Serm. xxxiii. and xxxiv.—Tr.)

* We here follow the account of Josephus, *Antiq.* xx. 9, which certainly is more credible than the legendary narrative of Hegesippus in Eusebius ii. 23. How can it be supposed that the heads of the Pharisaic party would have been foolish enough to demand of James, and to believe him capable of bearing, a public testimony against Christianity? Nor can I be induced by what Credner has said in his *Einleitung*, &c., p. 581, in which Rothe and Kern (see his *Commentary on the Epistle of James*, published in 1838, p. 341) agree with him, to give up the opinion I have here expressed. It would place the question on a different footing, if the interpolation of the passage in Josephus could be really proved. In that case, we must admit, that although the history of the martyrdom of James was garnished after an Ebionitish legend, yet the historical truth is to be discerned lying at its basis. But this interpolation does not appear to me proved. The words of Josephus, xx. c. 9, § 1, in which we include in brackets what is considered suspicious by Credner and others, are as follows: (he is here speaking of the high priest Ananus): Καθίζει συνέδριον κριτῶν καὶ παραγαγὼν εἰς αὐτὸ [τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ, Ἰάκωβος ὄνομα αὐτῷ, καὶ] τινὰς [ἐτέρους] ὡς παρανομησάντων κατηγορίαν ποιησάμενος παρέδωκε λυσθησομένους· ὅσοι δὲ ἐδόκουν ἐπιεικέστατοι τῶν κατὰ τὴν πόλιν εἶναι, καὶ τὰ περὶ τοὺς νόμους ἀκριβεῖς, βαρέως ἤνεγκαν ἐπὶ τοῦτῳ. (He caused a session of the council of the judges and bringing into it (the brother of Jesus, the so-called Christ,—his name was James—and) certain (others) whom he charged with violation of the law, he delivered them up to be stoned; but all the men of probity in the city, and those most scrupulous in things pertaining to the law, were sorely displeased at this.) Credner considers the clauses I have marked, as the interpolation of a Christian, because Josephus as a Jew would not have so emphatically prefixed the epithet "brother," ἀδελφὸν, &c., but rather have placed first the proper name, and because he must rather have called James "the just," τὸν δίκαιον, particularly as he has left his readers in almost total darkness as to the meaning of his whole designation of him. But since James might be best known by precisely that designation, which gave him the greatest importance whether in a good or a bad sense, according to the views of those who employed it, since Jesus who was

among the Jews were greatly dissatisfied with this proceeding, and Ananus, on account of it, was accused to the new governor, for which there was sufficient reason, as he had manifestly exceeded the limits of the power guaranteed to the Jewish Sanhedrim by the Roman law. See above, p. 56.

CHAPTER II.

THE APOSTLE PETER.

FROM James we now proceed to the apostle Peter, who, as appears from the course of historical development already traced, forms a connecting link between Paul and James, the two who with oneness of Spirit formed the most direct contrast to each other in their spheres of action and tendencies. We must here glance at the earlier elements entering into the formation of the character of Peter.

Simon was the son of Jonas, a fisherman in the town of Bethsaida, on the western shore of the Sea of Gennesareth in Galilee. The interest universally excited in this region respecting the appearance of the Messiah, which seized with peculiar force the ardent minds of the young, led him, among others, to that divinely enlightened man John the Baptist, who was called to prepare the way for that event. His brother Andrew, who had first recognised the Messiah in Jesus, imparted to him the glorious discovery. When the Lord saw him, he perceived, with his divine-human glance, what was in him, and he gave him the surname of the Rock-man, Cephas, Peter. This surname, like others which Christ gave

considered to be the Christ might be presumed to be known under that title, both among Gentile and Jewish readers, we have reason for thinking that the person of the brother of Jesus first presented itself to Josephus, and he mentioned this before adding the designation of the proper name. When those persons are mentioned who had been accused as violaters of the law, and whose condemnation had been blamed by the most devout of the Jewish nation, this would certainly lead us to think of the Christians who strictly observed the Mosaic law, and above all, we should refer this to James. When Christians were persecuted as Christians, or as opponents of the prevalent corruptions, the persecution would especially affect James, who had the greatest influence among the Jews, and was the firmest pillar of the Christian community. It is therefore in itself probable, that the persecution excited by the high priest would fall particularly on James. And if a Christian had interpolated this passage, he would hardly have satisfied himself with only foisting in these words, as a comparison with the interpolation of the other passage relating to Jesus himself, will convince us still more. In reference to the incredibility of such traditions as those of Hegesippus respecting the martyrdom of James, a comparison with the tales reported by Papias about the death of Judas Iscariot will serve for a proof. Perhaps the image of the martyrdom of Stephen suggested to the Ebionites their method of forming the account of the martyrdom of James.

his disciples, may be taken in a twofold point of view. The principal point of view which, without doubt, the Redeemer had in the imposition of the name, related to what Simon would become in and for the service of the gospel. But as the influences of transforming grace, always attaching themselves to the constitutional character of an individual, purify and ennoble it, so in this instance, what Peter was to become by the power of the divine life, was in a measure determined by his natural peculiarities. Prompt and firm in his grasp, his specially distinguishing characteristic was the capacity for ardent vigorous action, by which he effected so much in the service of the gospel. But the fire of his powerful nature needed first to be transformed by the flame of divine love, and to be refined from the impurity of selfishness, to make him the Rock-man in the publication of the gospel. By the natural constitution of his mind, he was indeed disposed to surrender himself at the moment entirely to the impression which seized him, without being turned aside by those considerations which would hold back more timorous spirits, and to express with energy what would move many minds; but he was easily misled by a rash self-confidence to say more, and to venture more, than he could accomplish; and though he quickly and ardently seized on an object, he allowed himself too easily to relinquish it, by yielding to the force of another sudden and powerful impression.

It was desirable that the first impression made on Peter's mind should continue to act upon him in quiet,—on which account Christ at first left him to himself; and when, by repeated operations, everything in his disposition was sufficiently prepared, he received him into the number of his disciples, who should everywhere accompany him. But that which gave the last decisive impression, was something exactly adapted* to Peter's former mode of life, and to his peculiar character. After Christ had finished one of his discourses in Peter's vessel, he desired him to let down his net for a draught. Although he had toiled in vain during the whole of the preceding night, yet he was quite ready to obey the command of the Redeemer, a proof of the confidence he already placed in him; and since, after the various preceding impressions which he received of the Divine in Christ, he was so astonished by the successful result,—the sense of the dignity and holiness of the personage who stood before him, as well as of his own unworthiness, so overpowered him, that he deemed himself not fit to be so near the Holy One,—Christ took advantage of the state of mind thus produced to draw him altogether to himself, and made this instance of success in his worldly occupation, by which Peter had been so wonder-struck, a symbol of the spiritual success which would attend his future labors in his service.

We find many indications of Peter's constitutional disposition in the relation subsisting between Christ and himself, and between himself and the other disciples. An illustration of this disposition occurred at that

* See *Life of Christ*, p. 269.

crisis, when after the miraculous feeding of the five thousand, the impression made by Christ on the minds of the multitude had reached its height, Christ opposed instead of fulfilling the sensuous expectations that had been excited, and the impression in his favor was reversed. When, therefore, many of those persons who had long been connected with Christ, forsook him, Christ said to the twelve disciples who still faithfully followed him, "Will ye also go away?" Peter testified of what they all felt of the divine impression which the words of Christ had made on his inmost soul, and how deeply he felt—more than he could yet distinctly apprehend,—that a divine life proceeded from his words, and that those who received his sayings were made partakers of a divine and blessed life enduring for ever. "To whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. We believe, we know, that thou art consecrated of God to the Messiahship." The conviction that Jesus was the Messiah, which Peter here expresses, was without doubt of a different kind from that which was produced by merely beholding the miracles he wrought. It was a conviction deeply seated in his religious and moral nature, which originated in his inward experience of the Divine in his intercourse with the Redeemer. Thus Christ declared, when Peter said to him, "Thou art the Messiah, the Son of the living God," Matt. xvi. 16, that this conviction was produced on his heart by the Spirit of God,—that he spoke not according to human opinion, but from the confidence produced by divine excitement,—that not flesh and blood, but his Father in heaven had revealed this to him. And since the conviction, thus grounded in the depths of his disposition, that Jesus was the Messiah, was the foundation on which the kingdom of God rested, in allusion to this fact Christ called him the Rock-man, the Rock on which he would build his church, which was to exist for ever. There is, indeed, a reference to Peter personally, and to his peculiar charism, but a special reference to that which had just happened when Peter, by testifying to the faith which was within them all, and which constituted the foundation of the kingdom of God, had proved himself to be qualified to be the representative of the church resting on the rock-foundation of faith in Jesus as the Saviour. What others silently shut up within them, it belonged to the peculiarity of Peter to proclaim aloud, and to proclaim on occasions that brought reproach, as well as on occasions that brought praise. Thus happened it that when Christ announced to his disciples his approaching sufferings, Peter felt impelled instantaneously as it arose in his heart, to express the sentiment which all felt, but hesitated to express, "That be far from thee, Lord!" But here the feeling of love to Him who was most fitted to kindle the fire of love in the heart, expressed itself in a natural human form so strongly, that Peter, with this state of disposition towards the cause of God, which requires the sacrifice of self, and of whatever is dearest to the heart, could not be an instrument in its service; and hence the Lord addressed him with words of severe rebuke, and assured him that, with such a disposition, valuing the person of man

higher than the cause of God, he could not remain in his fellowship; that by this disposition he became a tempter; Matt. xvi. We recognise the same tendency to be carried away by the sudden impulse of feeling, and to surrender himself to the vivid impression of the moment, when the Lord assured his disciples that, on the night of his Passion, all would forsake him; the too confident Peter at once exclaimed, "Though all men should forsake thee, yet will not I; I will lay down my life for thy sake." This over-hasty self-confidence soon turned, as the Lord foretold, to his disgrace, and gave occasion for bitter repentance. Yet this false step, no doubt, served to advance him in that self-knowledge which is the indispensable condition of true faith in the Redeemer and true knowledge of him, and thus to the whole development of the Christian life. And the Lord forgave him his sin; he reminded him of it in a manner the most tender, and yet piercing the very depths of his soul, by the question thrice repeated, "Lovest thou me?"* and required from him, as the proof of his love, the faithful discharge of his apostolic calling, the care of his sheep.†

But it is this peculiar character of Peter, as transformed by the divine life, with which we see him afterwards operating as an organ of the Holy Spirit in the service of the kingdom of God. We have already pointed out, in a former chapter, what an important position he occupied in this respect at the commencement of the Christian dispensation, until the appearance of the apostle Paul, and subsequently as an intermediate point between Paul's sphere of action among the Gentiles and that of the older apostles among the Jews. Though his nature, not yet thoroughly penetrated by the Divine, might still at times disturb and mar his exertions by its peculiar failings, yet the power of the divine principle of life within him, his love and fidelity to the Lord, were too great to be repressed by those corrupt tendencies, when the essential interests of the kingdom of God were at stake. The effect of sudden impressions is shown in his conduct at Antioch (*ante*, p. 204), but the subsequent his-

* We proceed here on the conviction, that the 21st chapter of John's gospel, although not composed by him, contains a credible tradition.

† It is indeed possible that these words referred personally to Peter, in the sense that he specially was at the first to take the lead in the guidance of the church, as *he* it certainly was who first spoke in the name of all, and who guided the deliberations on their common affairs;—and even if the words are so interpreted, a peculiar apostolic primacy is by no means committed to Peter, but the position entrusted to him was only in relation to existing circumstances, which he was peculiarly fitted to occupy by the *gift of government*, χάρισμα κυβερνήσεως, which harmonised with his natural talents. But these words may very probably be considered as a general description of the vocation of preaching the gospel—which, from a comparison with the parable in the 10th chapter of John, is very probable—and in this case, they contain nothing personal in relation to Peter as distinguished from the other apostles. Peter always appears as peculiarly fitted by his natural character to be the representative of the fellowship of the disciples, and hence he expressed what all deeply felt, and Christ particularly addressed to him those sayings which in their full extent related generally to all genuine disciples.

tory proves that, although Peter might be hurried by the power of a sudden impression to act in a way which involved a practical denial of principles which he had formerly avowed, yet he could not be seduced to be permanently unfaithful to these principles in his capacity of Christian teacher, and so to lay the foundation of a lasting opposition to Paul. On the contrary, he must have willingly allowed himself to be set right by Paul, since he thenceforward continued firmly united to him in the bond of apostolic fellowship.* An impartial examination of history shows that such fellowship always existed. The two apostles never ceased to acknowledge one another as genuine ministers of the gospel, though against the *tendency* which attributed an excessive authority to Peter, and would make everything bend to that—a foreshadowing of what in later centuries actually took place under the name of Peter—Paul must always have protested.

From Peter's ardent zeal, and from what we know of his successful efforts for spreading the kingdom of God till the conversion of Cornelius, we may infer that, during that period of his life respecting which we have no information, he extended still further the circle of his operations for the propagation of the gospel. As he is not mentioned in the Acts later than the account of the deliberations at Jerusalem† recorded in the 15th chapter, it seems probable that the scene of his subsequent labors lay at a distance from that city. According to an ancient tradition,‡ Peter published the gospel to the Jews scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Lesser Asia, and Bithynia. But this account has

* We can by no means agree in the opinion expressed by Elwart, in his acute Essay on Inspiration, in that valuable periodical the *Studien der evangelischen Geistlichkeit Württembergs*, vol. iii. No. 2, p. 72, that the old distinction for securing the idea of inspiration between *vitium conversationis* and *error doctrinae* is wholly untenable, and, therefore, the possibility of a mixture of error in the teaching of the apostles must be allowed. It can certainly be easily shown that the *error conversationis* does not here necessarily imply the *error doctrinae*. When Peter, in consequence of a sudden over-hastiness or weakness, suffered himself to be misled through regard to his Jewish fellow-believers, and to act in a manner which corresponded rather to the prejudices of others, than to his own better views, such a sudden practical error by no means justifies us in the conclusion, that his own knowledge of Christian truth had been eclipsed, and that his sounder views had entirely vanished. The most we could infer would be, that at this instant, when overpowered by impressions from without, he had no clear perception of the principles on which he was acting. Had he indeed not repented of this sudden false step arising from the fear of man,—had he hardened himself in this moral delinquency, a permanent obscuration of Christian consciousness itself must have been the consequence, and, as the history of many similar instances of backsliding exemplifies, a practical denial of the truth would have been followed by a theoretical one; but this could never come to pass in that individual in whom the spirit of Christ had attained such a preponderance over the selfish principle. And thus we are not at liberty to suppose, that Peter allowed the act into which he had been hurried by the power of a sudden temptation to establish itself in his teaching, to such extent as to prevent or obscure his perception of Christian truth.

† What Paul says in 1 Cor. ix. 5, suggests the journeys of the apostle.

‡ See Origen, t. iii. in *Genes*. Eusebius, iii. 1.

most probably arisen from a false conclusion from the superscription of his First Epistle.* This epistle of Peter leads us rather to suppose, that the scene of his labors was in the Parthian empire, for as he sends salutations from his wife in Babylon,† this naturally supports the conclusion, that he himself was in that neighborhood. And in itself, it is by no means improbable that Peter, whose ministrations related particularly to the descendants of the Jews, betook himself to a region where so many Jews were scattered; and what we know of the early spread of Christianity in those parts, serves to confirm the opinion. Yet the fact that Peter exercised his ministry at a later period in the countries composing the Parthian empire, by no means renders it impossible that he labored at an earlier period in Lesser Asia. Still it contradicts this supposition that, in the Pauline epistles, in which a fair opportunity was given to touch upon such a relation, we find no trace of Peter's residing in the circle of Paul's labors; this, however, we do not adduce as perfectly decisive evidence. But we must attach greater weight to the fact, that, in this epistle of Peter, there is no reference to his own earlier presence among the churches to whom it is addressed, though the object of this epistle must have especially required him to remind them of what they had heard from his own lips.

It appears then, that, after Peter had found his field of exertion among the Jews of the Parthian empire, he wrote to the churches founded by Paul and his disciples in Asia the epistle,‡ which is the only

* Origen's expression is very doubtful: "he seems to have preached," *κεκηρυχέναι εοικεν*.

† By a most unnatural interpretation, this has been supposed to mean an inconsiderable town in Egypt, a "fortified post," (*φρούριον ἐρυμνὸν*), at that time, see Strabo, xvii. 1, although this small town existed as late as the fifth century; see *Hist. Lausiaca*. c. 25. And there is nothing against our supposing that an inhabited portion of the immense Babylon was still left. Also, on the supposition that the First Epistle of Peter was forged in his name, it appears to me by no means natural for the writer to mention Rome under that designation. It cannot be proved that at the end of the first, or the beginning of the second, century Rome was commonly designated by the name of Babylon, and it might be expected that whoever forged such an epistle, would by some intimation let it be known that this name was to be taken symbolically, since it was of importance to him that all his readers should understand that the epistle was written from Rome. At all events, it is far more natural to understand by the words "elected together with," *ἡ συνεκλεκτῇ*, Peter's wife rather than the church. This, we feel assured, is the only sound interpretation of the word. The antiquity of the other explanation can prove nothing, since no tradition says anything of Peter's residence in these parts, but on the contrary, much attention was given to the tradition of Peter's journey to Rome, and, as there was an inclination to symbolical meanings, a point of connexion was found in the Apocalypse, so that this interpretation would easily gain acceptance. But indeed, whoever forged an epistle under the name of Peter would have supported himself by a more familiar tradition, and not have transported Peter to Babylon. If Peter sent salutations from his wife in Babylon, it perfectly agrees with what we are told in 1 Cor. ix. 5, that she accompanied Peter on his missionary journeys.

‡ Although Schwegler has expressed himself, in the second volume of his work on the post-apostolic age, with so much confidence on the spuriousness of this epistle, yet we

memorial preserved to us of his later labors. All the marks of its date unite in placing it in the last part of the apostolic age, in the period subsequent to Paul's first confinement. We find Silvanus, one of Paul's early fellow laborers, among Peter's attendants, which agrees very well

attach little or no weight to most of his reasons. He adduces as one mark of spuriousness, that the writer says and reports nothing about himself in a more definite manner. But if there had been more distinct allusions to Peter's character and history, they would doubtless have been regarded as a sign that some other person wished to pass himself off for Peter. And certainly, whoever had any motive for assuming the part of Peter, would have been induced to avail himself for this object of whatever he knew of the person and character of this apostle, and several things of this kind must have been known to any Christian who could forge such an epistle. But in this epistle we really find many marks by which Peter might make himself known in an unobtrusive manner, but quite different from those which another person would have chosen who wished to act Peter's part. Among such marks we reckon that Peter (v. 1,) describes himself as a witness of the sufferings of Christ. From the position occupied by Peter, this would appear very natural. But any forger of such an epistle, wishing to compile one after the pattern of the other apostolic epistles, would have chosen the resurrection of Christ, his miracles, or the transfiguration, as in the Second Epistle, rather than his passion. The author writes also as an eye-witness, before whom the image of a suffering Christ presented itself as a living presence, as a pattern for Christians. Schleiermacher, in his *Introduction*, p. 408, has very properly directed attention to ch. i. 8, in which the author does not make himself known, designedly, as one who had seen and personally known Christ, but, from an immediate consciousness that he stood in such a relation to Christ, writes to those who had stood in no such relation. The reference to Christ's descent into Hades, Schleiermacher regards as a mark of genuineness; for he thinks that whoever forged such an epistle, would not have placed himself on such slippery ground; "for evidently here is something which had not passed over into the common public teaching of Christians, and yet strikes us as something foreign to the New Testament representations." To this reason I cannot attach importance. A person might indeed have a motive, by writing under the name of an apostle, to give circulation to an opinion different from the current representations; and that opinion was not so foreign to the Christian thinking of the first ages as to Schleiermacher's. But when Schweigler reckons the introduction of this doctrine as one of the marks of a Pauline element in the epistle, foreign to Peter, as a deduction drawn and doctrinally formed in the Pauline circles from the Pauline principle of the universality of the Christian salvation, I can by no means agree with him. For this was not the universal application of this doctrine. Marcion had given to this doctrine, existing long before in other circles, a modification corresponding to his peculiar system. (See my Church History, vol. i. p. 460.)

And it may be questioned, whether without such an authority as that of Peter, this statement, which certainly agrees well with the Christian system, would have soon found such general acceptance. But the complete formation of such a representation, is well suited to the position of an apostle who had himself been an eye-witness of the death and resurrection of Christ. It was exactly to a person who had witnessed those great events, that such a question was most likely to occur, to which the answer is given in this statement. It is possible that the apostle, when in company with Christ after his resurrection, had made an inquiry on this subject, although we would not maintain that the doctrine was derived from such a source. And what Peter experienced in his early ministry among the Gentiles, and what he said on that occasion in the family of Cornelius, might form a point of connexion for his reflecting on such an agency on the part of Christ as is indicated in that passage. But it is to be remarked, that this topic is touched very cursorily, and by no means presented with that prominence and earnestness which might be expected from one who sought to gain acceptance for it by employing the authority of an apostolic name.

with our never meeting with Silvanus as Paul's companion, after his last journey to Jerusalem. The Christian churches to whom the epistle is directed, appear to us exposed to such persecutions as first arose about this period. The Christians were now persecuted *as Christians*, and according to those popular rumors of which Nero took advantage, were looked upon and treated as "evil-doers," (*κακοποιοὶ*, *malefici*). By the seriousness and strictness of their daily conduct, and their withdrawal from the public shows and other licentious amusements, they rendered themselves obnoxious, as in later times, to the hatred of the heathen populace; 1 Peter iv. 4, 5;* and if we reflect on the circumstances in which these churches were placed during Paul's first confinement, the design of the epistle will at once be apparent. As these churches had to contend with persecutions from without, so they were internally disturbed by those heretical tendencies of which we have spoken in a former chapter. Since the propagators of these errors accused Paul of falsifying the original Christian doctrine, and had appealed to the authority of the elder apostles in behalf of the continued obligation of the Mosaic law, Peter availed himself of the opportunity for addressing these churches, in order to establish them in the conviction, that the doctrine announced to them by Paul and his disciples and companions, of whom Silvanus was one, was genuinely Christian, and to exhort them to a faithful and steadfast

* Schwegler has controverted this view, and maintains that this epistle could only have been written under the Emperor Trajan; a position of the Christians is here implied which they were first placed in by that emperor's well-known rescript. But I cannot help pronouncing, alike the assumptions on which this writer proceeds, and the inferences he draws from them, to be wholly unfounded. The Neronian persecution proves, indeed, that the Christians were already the objects of popular hatred, and were accounted by the multitude as *malefici*. It could not fail but that popular hatred would show itself in their conduct towards the Christians. Although Christianity was not yet designated a *religio illicita* by an express enactment, yet it would follow of itself from the constitution of the Roman polity that the propagation of a religion which would involve the downfall of the religion of the State, would be illegal and worthy of punishment. As soon as it came to light that the "Christians," *Χριστιανοί*, were a *genus tertium*, Christianity must appear, even prior to any special legislation respecting it, as a *religio illicita*. Though Nero's persecution was only occasional and transient, yet what took place in the metropolis of the empire must have operated injuriously on the condition of Christians in the provinces. Everything which happened from this time to Trajan's first rescript, testifies of preceding persecutions against the Christians, in which, by the new law of Trajan, only a more legal arrangement had been made. We dare not allow ourselves to infer too much from the gaps in our knowledge of ecclesiastical history. The manner also in which persecutions are spoken of in ch. iv. 4, serve to mark them as new. How can any one who allows that the Apocalypse was written before Trajan's accession, fail to perceive the existence of earlier persecutions? Rev. vi. 9; xvii. 6; xx. 4. The last passage is peculiarly important, since it points to something more than a mere popular infliction of punishment, which would not have been satisfied with merely beheading the Christians. It appears from that passage that it was already established in the administration of Roman law, to apply this capital punishment to Christians—and hence we perceive the great gaps in our historical knowledge.

continuance in it.* These churches consisted for the most part of those who had been previously heathens, for such, in several passages, he supposes his readers to be; ii. 10; iv. 3. The superscription of the epistle is not inconsistent with this fact; for as Peter, by his training and peculiar sphere of labor, was apt to develop Christian truths in Old Testament images and comparisons, he transferred also the name of "dispersion" to the true church of God scattered among the heathen.

In reference to the internal and external circumstances of the churches, the object of this hortatory composition is two-fold; partly to ground them more firmly in the consciousness, that the source of happiness and the foundation of the everlasting kingdom of God was contained in that faith in the Redeemer which had been announced to them and received by them into their hearts,—that the doctrine announced to them was indeed the everlasting, unchangeable word of God, and hence they were to aim at appropriating, more and more with child-like simplicity, the pure, simple doctrine of the gospel delivered to them from the beginning, and thus continually advance to Christian maturity; and partly it was the apostle's design to exhort them to maintain their steadfastness in the faith under all persecutions, and a corresponding course of conduct by which they would shine forth in the midst of the corrupt heathen world, and refute the false accusations against Christianity and its professors.

Both these objects are pointed out by the apostle at the close of the epistle, when he says, "The faithful brother Silvanus is the bearer to you of this, a short epistle considering what I would gladly say to you, and which I have written for your encouragement, and to testify that it is the true grace† of God, in the firm possession of which you stand by faith."‡ The unassuming manner in which the writer of this epistle represents

* We can regard the declaration that such a production would be aimless as nothing but a mere assertion; and if it be held to be impossible that Peter should place himself in such relation to the churches founded by Paul, this can agree only with a supposition whose arbitrariness we have pointed out.

† Grace, the grace of redemption, a description of the whole contents of the gospel.

‡ The words may be certainly taken to mean, that Silvanus was the writer of the epistle, dictated by Peter either in Aramaic or Greek; but in this case, a salutation from Silvanus would probably have been added, especially since he must have been well known to these churches. The possibility of the interpretation which I have adopted, is evident from the phraseology which is adopted in the subscriptions of the Pauline epistles; and the use of the aorist, *ἔγραψα*, allowing for the epistolary style of the ancients, can prove nothing against it. From this interpretation we may also understand the commendatory epithet, "a faithful brother." The words "as I suppose," *ὥς λογίζομαι*, may indeed relate to what goes before, for this verb is used by Paul in Rom. viii. 18; Rom. iii. 28; 2 Cor. xi. 5, to denote a subjective conviction, without the accessory idea of any uncertainty in holding it. Peter might also wish to mark the subjective of his own judgment, for it was precisely the peculiar authority of Peter, to which many opposers of the Pauline school appealed. But if *λογίζομαι* is referred to what follows, it is equally a mark of subjective judgment or feeling. That which Peter wrote was, in relation to what he had in his heart to say to the churches, only a little. Yet had he intended to express that sentiment, he would rather have said, *δι' ὀλίγων, ὥς λογίζομαι*.

himself to the presbyters* of the churches to whom it is addressed, as one of their number, one of the number of Christian overseers, bears with it the impress of the apostolic spirit.

As the object for which this epistle must have been written perfectly corresponded to the circumstances of the times, there is nothing in its composition which would lead us to infer that the writer had forged it with a conciliatory design. A person of this description would hardly have put such a restraint on himself, and expressed himself so guardedly, that one part of his object—which according to this supposition was his principal object—could only be discovered by a careful investigation. The peculiar characteristic of Peter, his occupying a position between Paul and James, is indeed apparent in the epistle; but the points of contact with the Pauline element are also visible, as Paul had already exerted a preponderating influence on the formation of the Christian ideas, especially among those who used the Greek language. But we must here distinguish what is peculiarly Pauline from what was deduced in common from the same original source, and in the handling of dogmatical points we need not expect such strikingly marked mental peculiarity in the Rock-man of the church, as in a Paul or a John. Since this epistle, as a hortatory circular, is a counterpart of the Epistle to the Ephesians, we cannot think it strange if no references occur in it to special local circumstances, as in the other Pauline epistles, but that everything is more general. We might anticipate that this would be the case in such an epistle.

The expectation of the end of all things as impending, is suitable to the apostolic age, and the events in Nero's reign must have tended to awaken this expectation.

A comparison of the First Epistle of Peter with the Second ascribed to him, makes apparent the genuineness of the First, as well as the forgery of the Second; and as the Second is slightly supported by external evidence, we have made no use of it as a source of information for the biography of the Apostle.†

* Schwegler thinks, p. 27, that in 1 Pet. v. 1, there is indicated a distinction of condition between clergy and laity, a supposition that depends on an altogether false interpretation of the passage, after the manner of Baur in the *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*, 1838, No. 3, p. 93. It is impossible that church officers, who could have been called κληροί, should have been so treated. The word "heritage," κληρος, refers, as the connection shews, to "the flock of God," ποίμνιον τοῦ θεοῦ,—the churches over which the presbyters had been placed by divine appointment, and which had been entrusted to their guidance.

† The principal marks of the spuriousness of this epistle, are the difference of the whole character and style compared with the First, and the use here made of the Epistle of Jude, which is partly copied and partly imitated. The author assumes that he is writing to the same churches as those to whom the First Epistle of Peter is addressed, and yet what he says of his relation to his readers, is at variance with that assumption, for, according to the Second Epistle, they must have been persons who had been personally instructed by the apostle Peter, and with whom he stood in a close personal connexion, yet this was a

After the second half of the second century, a report was generally circulated that Peter died a martyr under the Emperor Nero at Rome.* According to a later tradition, when Peter was condemned to crucifixion, he scrupled, from a feeling of humility, to be put to death exactly in the same manner as the Saviour, and therefore requested that he might be crucified with his head downwards, and his feet upwards. Such a story bears on its front the impress of a later morbid piety rather than simple apostolic humility. The apostles exulted and rejoiced to imitate their Lord in all things, and the tradition thus formed does not appear to have been known to Tertullian, for though his peculiar turn of mind would have disposed him to receive such an account, he says expressly that Peter suffered in the same manner as Christ.†

With respect to the tradition, according to which Peter at last visited Rome, and there suffered martyrdom,—it does not well agree with what we have mentioned above respecting his residence in the Parthian Empire, for since this is supposed to have been after the Neronian persecu-

relation in which the churches to whom the First Epistle was addressed could not stand. The solicitude with which he endeavors to make himself known as the apostle Peter, betrays an apocryphal writer. The allusion to the words of Christ, John xxi. 18, in i. 14, is brought forward in an unsuitable manner. In order to distinguish himself as a credible witness of the life of Christ, he appeals to the phenomena at the transfiguration. But it certainly is not natural to suppose that one of the apostles should select and bring forward from the whole life of Christ, of which they had been eye-witnesses, this insulated fact, which was less essentially connected with that which was the central point and object of his appearance; the apostles were rather accustomed to claim credit as witnesses of the suffering and resurrection of Christ. Also the designation of the mountain on which the transfiguration occurred as "the holy mount," betrays a later origin, since we cannot suppose that the mountain usually so denominated, Mount Zion, was intended. Among the circumstances that excite suspicion, is the manner in which the same false teachers, who, in the Epistle of Jude, are described as actually existing, are here represented with prophetic warning, as about to appear. The doubts respecting the second coming of Christ, occasioned by the expectation of the immediate occurrence of that event in the first age of the church, and the disappointment of that expectation, leads us to recognise a later period. What is said of the origin of the world from water, and its destruction by fire, does not correspond to the simplicity and practical spirit of the apostolic doctrine, but rather indicates the spirit of a later age, mingling much that was foreign with the religious interest. The mode of citing the Pauline epistles, confirms also the suspicion against the genuineness of this epistle. A passage from Rom. ii. 4, is cited iii. 15, as if this epistle had been addressed to the same church. A collection of all the Pauline epistles is referred to, and it is assumed, that Paul in all of them referred to one subject which yet by no means appears in all. Paul's epistles are quoted as "scriptures," *γραφαί*, as one apostle would certainly not have expressed himself respecting the epistles of another apostle, for this term in the apostolic epistles is always used only to designate the writings of the Old Testament. This epistle was probably forged by those who wished to combat the Gnostic errors, and the opinion broached by the Gnostics of a contrariety between the apostles Peter and Paul, by the borrowed authority of the former.

* The first trace of this is to be found in Origen, Euseb. iii. 1. The complete narrative in Jerome, *de Viris Illustrib.* i.

† De Præscript. 36. Ubi Petrus passioni dominicæ adæquatur.

tion, and since the martyrdom of Peter, according to ancient accounts, must have happened at the same time as Paul's, Peter must within a short period have changed the scene of his labors from one very distant region of the globe to another. And it appears strange that he should have relinquished his labors in a region where so much was to be done for the spread of the gospel, and betake himself to one at so great a distance, where Paul and his associates had already laid a good foundation, and were continuing to build on the foundation already laid. But so many circumstances unknown to us might conspire to bring about such an event, that with our defective knowledge of the church history of that time, what we have stated cannot be considered a decisive evidence against the truth of the tradition, if it can be sufficiently supported on other grounds. We can also easily imagine a particular interest which would induce Peter to change his scene of labor to Rome, the same interest which was the occasion of his writing the first epistle, that of healing the division which in many parts existed between his own adherents and those of Paul. This division would find a rallying point in the opposition between the Gentile Christians and Judaizing elements in the church at Rome, and the movements in the metropolitan church would exert an influence over the whole church; and this might be a consideration of sufficient weight with Peter to induce him to undertake a journey to Rome. We only need inquire, therefore, whether this tradition is adequately supported by credible witnesses.

The Roman Bishop Clemens appears as the first witness of the martyrdom of Peter. If he expressly stated that Peter was martyred at Rome, we should have incontrovertible evidence and require no further examination. But such an exact determination of the place is wanting. Yet it cannot be concluded that Clemens did not know the name of the place where Peter suffered martyrdom, for there was no need of such particularity for his readers when he was writing of an event which he might assume to be generally known. It cannot be maintained, that when he was writing at the place where Peter shed his blood as a witness of the faith, and simply enumerating examples of steadfastness in persecuted champions of the faith, he should in such connexion feel himself bound expressly to mention the scene of his last sufferings. Even in commemorating Paul's martyrdom, we find no such phrase as "here before our eyes," "in the city from which I am now writing to you." It may appear strange that Clemens speaks in such general terms of Peter as a person of whom he possessed no precise information,* and on the other hand speaks in such definite terms of Paul. This might justify the conclusion that he had really no exact information respecting Peter's end, and hence we might be allowed to infer that the scene of Peter's labors was to the very time of his martyrdom at a distance from

* Οὐχ ἓνα, οὐδὲ δύο, ἀλλὰ πλείονας ὑπήνεγκε πόνους καὶ οὕτω μαρτυρήσας. (Not one, nor two, but many sufferings were borne by him, and thus he became a martyr.)

Rome.* Yet on the other hand it may be said, that Clemens, as one of Paul's disciples, was induced to speak of him in more definite terms, and though Peter met with the close of his labors at Rome, that Clemens could not say much of his earlier conflicts.† The first person who distinctly states the martyrdom of Peter at Rome is Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, who wrote in the latter half of the second century. In his epistle to the church at Rome,‡ he calls that and the Corinthian the common planting of Peter and Paul. Both had planted the church at Corinth, and had equally taught there. In the same manner they had both taught in Italy and suffered martyrdom at the same time. Here we find a definite statement of the martyrdom of Peter at Rome, though accompanied indeed by great want of exactness. Dionysius does not absolutely say that Peter and Paul taught at Corinth at the same time, which, in reference to the time before the first confinement of Paul at Rome, certainly cannot be admitted, and in reference to the time after that event, can hardly be supposed. But at all events, he is not accurate in terming the Corinthian church the common planting of the apostles. For, supposing that the tradition of Peter's journey to Rome is credible, it might happen that, after the first confinement of Paul, he visited Corinth, but he could do nothing towards founding a church which already had been established there. Perhaps this whole account proceeded, partly from misunderstanding the references to the apostle Peter in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, partly from attempting to trace the origin of this *ecclesia apostolica* from the two most distinguished apostles. The same remark will apply to the church at Rome. And according to what we have stated above,§ Paul came from Spain as a prisoner to Rome, and could not have appeared there as a teacher in conjunction with Peter.|| But this inaccuracy in the representation of events long past, in which Dionysius allowed himself to be guided more by uncertain inferences than by historical traditions, cannot be employed to weaken the weight of his depo-

* I by no means find sufficient ground for doubting that Clemens had been a follower of Paul; for I cannot consider as historically credited what is narrated of the connexion between Clemens and Peter, in legends such as the Clementines, which bear the impress of being framed to answer a certain purpose.

† Frederick Spanheim, and lately Baur, have endeavored to prove too much from the manner in which Clemens here expresses himself. See the acute and learned discussion already referred to in the *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*, 1831, No. 4, p. 151.

‡ Eusebius, ii. 25.

§ See page 317.

|| The passage in Dionysius might certainly, with Dr. Schott, in his "Examination of some Chronological Points in the History of Paul," Jena, 1832, p. 131, be so understood as to remove this difficulty. In the sentence, *ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν ὁμοσε διδύξαντες, ἐμαρτύρησαν κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν*, (having taught in like manner and at the same place in Italy, they became martyrs at about the same time,) *ὁμοσε* may be so understood, that only the equal extension of the direction of their labors to Italy may be intended by it; but does not the repetition of *ὁμοίως*, the distinguishing of this word from *ὁμοσε*, and its comparison with the *κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν* of the martyrdom of both, favor another interpretation?

sition respecting a fact not strictly connected with the other points, and on which he could easily obtain certain information from his contemporaries. We have no sufficient ground to deny that Dionysius, in what he says of Peter's martyrdom at Rome, followed an ancient credible tradition, although he falsified his report to a certain extent by the circumstances with which he arbitrarily connected it. From his times, this account appears the unanimous tradition of ecclesiastical antiquity. The graves of the two apostles were pointed out at Rome, as the Roman presbyter Caius, at the end of the second century, appeals to them; but yet these graves do not furnish incontestable evidence. When the report was once set afloat, the designation of the locality where the apostles were buried would easily be added. Even by Caius the misstatement is made, that both the apostles were the founders of that church.

The weight of this tradition is increased by the fact that its origin cannot be easily accounted for, if it be not regarded as historical evidence. We certainly cannot account for it, from the attempt to place on a sure basis the authority of the *Cathedra Petri* in Rome, for this tradition is assuredly more ancient than the attempt to secure to the *Cathedra Petri* at Rome a decisive authority in matters of doctrine; such an attempt, which it is difficult to deduce only from the transference of the homage paid to the city, to the church of the city, would rather presuppose the existence of the tradition. Since the pretensions of the Roman church were not universally acknowledged, but in many quarters met with opposition, they will not serve to explain how it came to pass, that such a tradition designedly propagated by Rome, was everywhere so favorably received. But in truth, many other circumstances could combine to give rise to this report and to promote its circulation. As Peter concluded his labors in a region so separated from connexion with the Roman empire, there would be the greater temptation to fill up the gaps of authentic history by hearsays and fictions. The practice of representing Peter as the victor over Simon Magus, in the contest for the simple faith of Revelation, gave rise to manifold legendary tales about his travels, such as the story of his earlier residence in Rome under the emperor Claudius, and the disputation he there held with Simon. And besides, it seemed suitable that the church of the metropolis of the world should be founded by the two most distinguished apostles, who had also founded the Corinthian church, and be signalized by their death; it was also thought desirable that the coöperation of the two apostles in that church on which, as the church of the world, and chief city, all eyes were directed, should be contrasted with that direct opposition between them which the Judaizers, like the Gnostics, were anxious to make out. When, after the Apocalypse came into circulation, it was usual to designate the imperial city by the name of Babylon, as the stronghold of the heathenism which opposed the kingdom of God, this name, as it occurred in the First Epistle of Peter, was naturally applied to Rome, and thus, too, an argument was found for the belief of that apostle's visit to Rome.

Although the origin of the story of the journey of the apostle Peter to Rome, and of his martyrdom there, may in this way be in some measure explained, yet the high antiquity of the tradition, which can be traced back to the very boundaries of the apostolic age, presents an objection of no inconsiderable weight to this hypothesis. Papias, the bishop of Hierapolis,* who appeals to an oral tradition of an individual belonging to the apostolic age, the presbyter John, reports, that the Gospel of Mark† was composed by the same person who accompanied Peter as an interpreter, for the purpose of preserving in writing what he had heard Peter narrate in his public addresses,‡ and what had been impressed on his own memory. Now, it is evident that this account (whether it relates to that Gospel of Mark which is still extant, or to a lost original document of the evangelical history, which served for its basis) cannot be true in its full extent; for how can we suppose, that Mark, the nephew of Barnabas, who at all events must have come when young to Jerusalem, and lived there in company with the apostles, could have first planned his evangelical narrative according to what he heard at a much later period, incidentally from the preaching of Peter? This account therefore is suspicious;§ but may it not be so far true, that Mark accompanied the apostle Peter to Rome, and acted there as his interpreter, for those persons who were familiar only with the Latin language? Yet after all, it is difficult to explain how such a belief could have existed so early, unless there had been a tradition that Peter had left the scene of his labors in the Parthian empire at a later period, and visited Rome,—especially since what Papias says rests on the report of a man in the apostolic age. As Silvanus, the early travelling companion of Paul, joined Peter in the Par-

* Euseb. Hist. Eccl. iii. 39.

† Although the marks attributed by Papias to the Gospel of Mark, do not agree with the form in which it has come down to us, it does not follow that Papias referred to another document; for in such a description of the qualities of a book lying before him, much depends on the subjective judgment, and we certainly cannot give Papias credit for the talent of acute and accurate observation. We must also remember that he compared the Gospel of Mark, not with our Matthew, but with another that formed its basis, *συνταγμάτων, λόγων τοῦ κυρίου* (collections, words of the Lord.)

‡ See above, p. 102.

§ It may be asked whether this Mark is the same with the one mentioned by Peter as his son. The association of him with the wife of Peter, and the want of an exact determination of the epithet "son," would favor our understanding it in the proper sense. And it is no ground of objection to this, that a son of Peter should have a Roman name, and no reason for its improbability that he should greet Christian churches from his son, through the spirit of fellowship which should exist among all Christians. Yet if Peter himself had no sons, we can well suppose in this connection that he points out one who stood to him in the place of a son. But tradition says, at least, that Peter had children. "For Peter and Philip begat children," Πέτρος μὲν γὰρ καὶ Φίλιππος ἐπαιδοποίησαντο. Clemens Stromat. i. iii. 448. But even if Peter had other sons it is not impossible but that he designated Mark as his son on account of the near relation in which he stood to him, if he could suppose the churches, to whom he wrote and to whom Mark was well known, would be in no danger of misunderstanding him.

thian empire, so Mark might likewise remove thither from Lesser Asia, Coloss. iv. 10, and travel with him to Rome, even though he was not that Mark whom Peter mentions in his first epistle. There is an ancient tradition preserved for us by Clemens of Alexandria, that when Peter saw his wife led to martyrdom, he called out to her, mentioning her name,* "O remember the Lord!" We have no reason for casting a doubt on the truth of such a simple tradition. But that single characteristic traits of this kind in Peter were handed down by tradition, agrees best with the supposition that his last years were not spent in the Parthian empire, between which and the Roman there was little intercourse. In the existing circumstances of the Parthian empire as respects the mixture of native and foreign religions, it would be difficult to account for the martyrdom of a Christian woman. Hence, we are led to refer it most naturally to the effects of the Neronian persecution at Rome.

* Φασί γ' οὖν τὸν μακάριον Πέτρον, θεασάμενον τὴν αὐτοῦ γυναῖκα ἀγομένην τὴν ἐπὶ θάνατον, ἡσθῆναι μὲν τῆς κλήσεως χάριν [καὶ τῆς εἰς οἶκον ἀνακομιδῆς]· ἐπιφωνῆσαι δὲ εὖ μάλα προστρεπτικῶς τε καὶ παρακλητικῶς ἐξ ὀνόματος προσειπόντα· μεμνήσθω αὐτῇ τοῦ κυρίου. (They say, therefore, that the blessed Peter, seeing his wife led away to death, understood from the summons also her return home; that, encouragingly and entreatingly addressing her by name, he called aloud, 'Remember the Lord!') Clem. Alex. Strom. i. vii. [vol. iii. p. 253, ed. Klotz. Lipsiæ, 1832.] The words I have enclosed in brackets are difficult, whether we understand by them that his wife, before she was led to death, came home once more, and then was thus addressed by Peter, or, more naturally, that she would be restored to him again, being redeemed from death. Yet, in the connexion, there are great difficulties in either interpretation, and we must rather understand the words of a return to her heavenly home, if the reading be correct, and we should not (which yet I do not venture to maintain) read *οἶκον οὐράνιον*.

BOOK V.

THE APOSTLE JOHN AND HIS MINISTRY AS THE CLOSING POINT OF THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

THE ministry of the apostle John reaches to the limits of the Apostolic Age. He was the son of Zebedee, a fisherman (probably wealthy),* in the small town of Bethsaida or Capernaum, on the western side of the Sea of Gennesareth in Galilee. Many eminent men in all ages, who have been great blessings to the church, have been indebted to their pious mothers for the first incitement of their dispositions to piety and the first scattering of the seeds of religion in their hearts, and this appears to have been the case with John. The manner in which his mother Salome†

* As we may conclude from Mark i. 20.

† Compare Mark xv. 40, xvi. 1, and Matt. xxvii. 56. If an opinion, advocated with great acuteness and learning by Wieseler in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1840, iii. p. 648,—an opinion at all events worthy of examination,—could be established, it would show that Salome and John were closely connected with Christ by the bonds of relationship. According to this view, not *three* women (as has hitherto been supposed), but *four*, are named in John xix. 25; the Mary, the wife of Cleopas, must not be identified with the sister of the mother of Jesus, but is quite a different person. Hence it follows, that we have to search for the name of the remaining sister of the mother of Jesus, which is not here given. Now, since in Matt. xxvii. 56, Mark xv. 40, besides Mary of Magdala, and Mary the mother of James and Joses = the wife of Cleopas, Salome also, or the mother of the sons of Zebedee, is named as present at the crucifixion, it would appear that the sister of Mary the mother of Jesus, whose name is not given by John, can be no other than Salome, his own mother. Thus the difficulty of the same name belonging to both sisters is entirely obviated. It would also follow that, in fact, James the son of Alpheus, or Cleopas, was not the son of the sister of Mary the mother of Jesus, (consequently, not *his* cousin;) and this would furnish additional and valid proof for our supposition, that James the brother of the Lord was not identical with the apostle. But the manner in which (John xix. 25) Mary the wife of Cleopas is mentioned without any connective particle, appears to me to imply that these words are only in apposition to distinguish the (otherwise) unnamed sister of the mother of Jesus. If the sister of the mother of Jesus, was a person then generally known by name, in the circle in which John wrote his gospel, I could then more easily conceive, that, by that collocation of the words, such an ambiguity might be occasioned; but I do not believe that such a supposition is justifiable: and was it not to be expected from John that, though he had not mentioned the sister of the mother of Jesus by name,

united herself to the company which was formed round the Saviour, leads us to attribute to her the predominance of a pious disposition, and from the petition which she made to the Redeemer, Matt. xx. 20, we may conclude, that her mind was filled with the expectation of the approaching manifestation of the Messiah's kingdom, an expectation which had been so vividly excited in the devout part of the Jewish nation by the predictions of the prophets and the exigencies of the age: we may therefore imagine how strenuously she endeavored to inflame her son's heart with the same earnest desire. The direction thus given to the mind of the youth impelled him to join John the Baptist, by whose guidance he was first led to the Saviour; John i. 37. In his company he spent several hours,* but Christ wished not to bind him permanently to himself at once. He allowed him to return for the present to his usual occupation. He drew him, like Peter, gradually into closer communion with himself, intending in the first interview so to influence him, that there should develop itself from within a longing for a more intimate connexion. And when he had for some time been wishful after an abiding nearness to Him who had wrought with such power on his inmost soul, when the call at last was issued, Matt. iv. 22, he was ready at once to forsake all and follow Him everywhere. What distinguished John was the union of the most opposite qualities, as we have often observed in great instruments for the advancement of the kingdom of God,—the union of a disposition inclined to silent and deep meditation, with an ardent zeal, though not impelling to great and diversified activity in the outward world; not a fiery zeal, such as we may suppose filled the breast of Paul. But there was also a love, not soft and yielding, but a passion that seized with all its

he yet would have pointed her out more definitely as the mother of the disciple whom Jesus loved? Also, it does not seem probable to me, since the kinship of John to Jesus would be so important for explaining the early and peculiar connexion into which he entered with Christ, that no trace of it should make its appearance in the narrative of our gospels, where there was so often an opportunity of mentioning it. The origin of later accounts of so close a relationship between the apostle John and Christ, may be easily explained without the supposition of an historical foundation.

* In order to know the length of time spent by John in this first interview with the Redeemer, we must determine the mode of computing the hours adopted in John's Gospel. According to the commonly received mode of reckoning, it could not have been more than three hours; and then it is remarkable that John should say, "they abode with him that day," of which only so few hours were left. On the contrary, if, like some of the older writers, (see *Wolfii Curæ* on John xix. 14,) and more recently *Rettig* (in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1830, part i. p. 106), we suppose that John adopted the Roman mode of counting the hours from midnight, the length of time would be from ten in the morning to sunset. Yet the words of John, as a more negligent mode of expression, may be understood according to the common interpretation; and the passage in John iv. 6, favors our thinking that he reckoned time in the usual manner. And, in itself, it is more probable that the first impression which the Redeemer made on John's mind resulted only from a short interview.

might, and firmly retaining the object to which it was directed, abruptly repelled whatever would disgrace its object, or attempt to wrest it from its possession; this was his leading characteristic. Yet this love had a selfish and intemperate character, of which we have several instances, as when he wished to call down divine judgments on the Samaritans, who had not shown due honor to the Saviour; and when he expressed his displeasure that some persons who had not united themselves to the disciples of the Lord, had performed miracles similar to their own by calling on his name; and when his mother, in concert with her two sons, presented a petition to Christ for stations of eminence in his kingdom. Probably the title "Son of Thunder," which the Redeemer bestowed on him, related not less to his natural temperament than to what he became by its purification and transformation in the service of the gospel. But this ardent love with which he devoted himself wholly to the service of the Redeemer, became now the purifying principle of his whole being, while he sought to form himself on the model of that holy personality. And hence he could receive the image of it on the side which corresponded with his peculiarly contemplative mental tendency, and reproduce it in a living form.

John was certainly distinguished from James the brother of the Lord, in this respect, that from the first his communion with Christ was independently developed on the peculiar basis of Christian consciousness; the fountain of divine life which had appeared among mankind, became at once the central point of his spiritual existence: yet he did not wholly agree with Paul, for his Christian consciousness was not formed in direct opposition to an earlier and tenaciously held Judaism. His whole character and mental formation indisposed him to such a development. The mystical contemplative element which finds its archetype in John, is more prone to adopt outward forms (attributing to them a spiritualized, elevated meaning) than to oppose them, and John, whom Judaism had led to the Saviour as its ultimate object, found no difficulty in employing the forms of the Jewish cultus as the prefiguring symbols of his Christian views. From him, therefore, there could not proceed, as from a Paul, the abolition of those forms with which the Christian spirit was yet enveloped.* Though John (Gal. ii. 9) appears as one of the three pillars

* What Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, says of John, in his letter to Victor, Bishop of Rome, in Euseb. v. 24, "who was made a priest and wore the diadem," *ὃς ἐγένετο ἱερεὺς τὸ πέταλον πεφορεκῶς* is untrue if taken literally, as it insinuates something far beyond the presumption that John was a faithful observer of the Jewish law so long as he remained at Jerusalem. It would follow that he had held the office of High Priest among the Jews, for this *πέταλον* = *בִּרְמָה לְיִצְחָק*, the golden front-plate, was one of the distinctive insignia of his office. Such a presumption would, however, be in contradiction to history and all historical analogy. Nor can Polycrates himself, however credulous we may think him to have been, have meant it. It is moreover clear from the context, that he affirms of John only such things as would be consistent with John's Christian convictions. Or, are we to assume that John, as the President of all the Christian communities in Lesser Asia,

of the church among the Jewish Christians, yet it never happened that they appealed to him as to Peter and James ; but it may be explained from the peculiar views and character of this apostle, and serves to set in a clear light his relation to the contending parties. Hence also we gather, that though John had formed a scheme of doctrine so decidedly marked, and though in relation to the other great publishers of the gospel, he might have formed a party who would have attached themselves particularly to him, and principally or exclusively have valued his idea of Christianity, yet in the Pauline age, we see no Johannean party come forward by the side of the Jacobean, the Petrine, and the Pauline. The peculiar doctrinal type of John was also of a kind little suited to find acceptance with the peculiar tendencies of the Jewish Christians in Palestine, and its influence would be more powerfully felt, where a Christian element had already combined itself with the form of the Grecian mind.

Thus John disappears from public history, till he was led by the divine call to other regions, where the minds of the people were already prepared for his peculiar influence, and where the deep traces of his operations, undeniable to every one capable of historical investigations, were still visible far into the second century. After the martyrdom of Paul, the bereaved scene of his labors, so important for the development and spread of the kingdom of God, and exposed to so many polluting and destructive influences, required above all things the guiding, protecting, and healing hand of apostolic wisdom. The Epistle of Peter to the churches in that region, and the journey of Sylvanus thither, show how much this necessity was felt. It is probable, that John was called upon by the better part of the churches, to transfer the seat of his activity to this quarter. All the ancient traditions, which may be traced back to his immediate disciples, agree in stating that Lesser Asia was the scene of his labors to the end of the first century, and Ephesus its central point.

The constitution of the churches of Lesser Asia, as it appeared soon after the age of John, in the time of Polycarp bishop of Smyrna, was altogether different from that which originated in the Pauline age, in which these churches were founded, and we are obliged to presuppose some intervening influences by which this alteration was produced. Originally these churches formed, as we have seen above, a pure opposition against

adopted, as a symbolical token of his position in the guidance of the Church, the insignia of the Jewish High Priest? This would be in direct contradiction to the apostolic, and especially the Johannean views, for these included the acknowledgment of the sole high-priesthood of Christ, and the universal priesthood of all believers founded upon it. Polycrates, therefore, could have said this of John only with a symbolical reference, whether he intended to denote by it what he had suffered for the confession of the Christian faith, or the place which he occupied at the head of the guidance of the church. Just as the High Priest's costume has a symbolical meaning in the *Testament of the Patriarchs*. *The Testament of Levi*, iii. 8 : Πέταλον τῆς πίστεως.

the Jewish-Christian form of cultus. They had, at most, no other day than Sunday devoted to religious celebration,* no kind of yearly feast; but afterwards we find among them a paschal feast transferred from the Jews, and receiving a Christian meaning, though imitating the Jewish reckoning as to the time of its celebration, to which probably a feast of Pentecost was annexed, and in their disputes with the Roman church they appealed particularly to a tradition originating with this apostle. Now we can readily imagine that the fourteenth day of the month Nisan,† on which he was an eye-witness of the sufferings of Christ, would excite a deep interest in his Christian feelings. It is self-evident how those Jewish feasts, which had gained a new importance for him by their association with those great facts of the Christian faith of which he had been an eye-witness, and which he had been wont to celebrate with Christian devotion, might be introduced by him into these churches founded on Pauline principles.‡

* See page 159.

† The Gospel to which Polycrates appeals in Eusebius, v. 24, may certainly be that of John; see remarks on this in my *Life of Christ*, p. 385.

‡ But when Schwegeler, from the obscure expressions of Polycrates quoted above, deduces the fact that John had assumed the high-priest's dress as overseer-general of the churches in Asia Minor, and then, again concludes, what on such a supposition would be a fair inference, that one who thus acted and placed himself in such a relation to Judaism, could not be the author of the Gospel under his name—he adopts a method, according to which it is only requisite to find proofs for a system formed on arbitrary assumptions and combinations, and according to which all separate traditions are only so far to be thought credible, as they serve to support such a system. This single feature is literally adhered to, though it stands in contradiction to everything else we know of that age. Where can we find anything bearing an analogy to it, unless something isolated in the uncritical and credulous Epiphanius? It may indeed be admitted that the Christian feasts became changed into the Jewish; for this there was a medium in the spiritualization of the Old Testament Theocracy proceeding from Christianity. But it was altogether different with the priesthood. The principles of Christianity connect themselves with the idea of a priesthood only so far, that Christ is regarded as the only High Priest, and the universal priesthood of all believers is derived from him; hence no such relation can be found as that which existed on the theory and method of the Old Testament cultus—(*vide* pp. 135, 156). Moreover, as Christianity still moved in the forms of Judaism, the principle of Christ's priesthood was employed in the formation of church relations. The position of James among the Jewish Christians cannot here be adduced as a proof of John's position, but goes rather to establish the opposite; for great as was the reverence in which he was held, we find no trace of his being invested with anything like the Jewish priesthood. For even Hegesippus is far from placing him in such a relation to the Christian church, although from his ascetic, Ebionitish proclivities—which we are by no means justified in making identical with those of the Jewish Christians, and cannot ascribe even to Polycrates—he says, that James in virtue of his sanctity wore not a woollen, but a linen garment like a priest, and that in virtue of this priestly sanctity he alone was allowed to go into the holy place of the Temple. (Τούτῳ μόνῳ ἐξῆν εἰς τὰ ἅγια εἰσιέναι, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἑρεοῦν ἐφάρει, ἀλλὰ σινδόνας.—Euseb. ii. 23.) With all its Jewish coloring, the idea of the universal Christian priesthood is the only one brought forward in the Apocalypse. In *The Testament of the twelve Patriarchs*, which has so strong a Jewish impress, the view predominates that Christ is the true High Priest who has made an end of the Old Testament priesthood. (L. 6

From the state of the church at that time in these parts, it may be concluded that John must have had to endure many conflicts, both from within and without, in his new field of labor. After the signal had once been given under Nero for public attacks on the Christians, persecutions were carried on in various parts. In Lesser Asia, many circumstances combined, then as in later times, to excite a more vehement persecution; fanatical zeal for the ancient idolatry—the danger which threatened the pecuniary interests of those who in some way were gainers by the popular worship, from the rapid progress of Christianity—the hatred of the Jews widely scattered through Lesser Asia, who blasphemed Christianity, and stirred up the heathen populace against it. Hence in the Apocalypse the rebukes uttered against the synagogues of Satan, against those who “say they are Jews, but are not and do lie;” Rev. ii. 9. The civil wars and the universal misery that followed, contributed still more to excite the popular fury against the enemies of the gods, to whom they readily ascribed the origin of all their misfortunes. Thus, indeed, the Apocalypse testifies (which was probably written in the first period after John’s arrival in Lesser Asia) throughout, of the flowing blood of the martyrs, and of the tribulation which threatened Christians in prison, as well as of the fresh recollections of Nero’s cruelties. In the churches themselves, those conflicts continued which we noticed at the close of the Pauline age, and the seeds of discord and heresy then germinating had now sprung up and advanced towards maturity. Falsifiers of the original truth, who gave themselves out for apostles, had come forth; Rev. ii. 2.* To the inspiration of genuine Christianity had at-

Μέχρι τελειώσεως χρόνων ἀρχιερέως Χριστοῦ.) From him a new priesthood was to go forth among the Gentiles, which may probably be understood of the universal priesthood established by him, though we cannot with certainty decide on the sense of the passage. (L. c. 9, *Ποιήσκει ἱερατείαν νέαν κατὰ τὸν τύπον τῶν ἔθνων εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.*) If John had thus applied the high priesthood to the Christian church, what a powerful influence it would have exerted in modifying its constitution, and how much earlier would the Hierarchical element have been diffused! Manifold traces of so early a transference of the Old Testament conceptions to the government of the Christian church, must everywhere have met us. What was not developed till the third century, must have appeared as the original arrangement. We see indeed, afterwards, a Jewish hierarchical element internally developed in conflict with the original Christian consciousness. But it is quite unhistorical to attempt deducing from that ancient Ebionitism, which belongs to a totally different stage of development, this new form of the Jewish spirit, which arose of itself, after the Jewish position had been long overthrown, and Christianity had attained an independent development. To apply to every mixture of Judaism and Christianity the common name of Ebionitism, and distinguish it into various kinds and stages of development, must inevitably lead to the worst perversions of history.

* We find no justification whatever for asserting, with Schwegeler, that these words refer to Paul, and in concluding that in Lesser Asia an Ebionitish spirit prevailed, in opposition to the apostolic authority of Paul. The disapprobation here expressed is directed not against one, but against several. Of what kind these were, we must learn from the subsequent contents of the Apocalyptic Epistles, and by examination of these we shall be led to the wholly opposite conclusion mentioned in the text. Schwegeler adduces in proof of his explanation the words of Paul in 1 Cor. xvi. 9; according to this, we must suppose

tached various wild extravagances which Paul had foreseen and against which he had already raised a warning voice. Pretended prophets and prophetesses had arisen, who, under the appearance of divine illumination, threatened to plunge the churches into errors both theoretical and practical; 1 John iv. 1; Rev. ii. 20.

In Lesser Asia, the most opposite deviations from the genuine evangelical spirit sprang up together. On the one side, the Judaizing tendency, as we have noticed it in the Pauline age; on another side, in opposition to it, the tendency of an arrogant sensual desire of freedom, such as we have noticed in the freethinkers of the Corinthian church,* only carried to greater lengths and more daring results, and mingled probably with many theoretical errors; persons who taught that whoever penetrated into the depths of knowledge,† need no longer submit to the apostolic ordinances, as he would be free from all the slavery of the law, which freedom they understood in a carnal sense, and misinterpreted to an immoral purpose. Such a one need no longer fear the contact with heathenism or with the kingdom of Satan; in the consciousness of his own mental strength he could despise all temptations, partake of the meat offered to idols, and indulge in sensual pleasures without being injured thereby. In the Apocalypse these people are called Nicolaitanes, either because they were really the adherents of a certain Nicolaus,‡ and that this name, as a translation of the Hebrew נִיְלָאִי, occasioned an allusion to the meaning of the name, and a comparison with Balaam, or that the name, a pure invention, was used by the author to denote symbolically a seducer of the people like Balaam. The opposition against this

that the Judaizing party, of whom Paul speaks in that passage, had at last obtained the victory in the Ephesian church, and on that account were praised by the author in that epistle. But this is a manifest perversion of the words; for according to the connexion, they relate only to the enemies of Christianity generally. Rather, in that passage, the name of false apostles is used to designate false teachers who aimed at being held in great repute, as in 2 Cor. xi. 9, where no one who pays attention to the connexion will think of the earlier apostles.

* See page 232.

† Rev. ii. 24, they are described as those "who have not known the depths of Satan, as they speak," *οἱ τινες οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὰ βάθη τοῦ σατανᾶ, ὡς λέγουσιν*. But a doubt here arises, whether these persons made it their peculiar boast that they knew the depths of the Deity, but the author of the Apocalypse, as if in mockery of their pretensions, substitutes for the depths of the Deity the depths of Satan (as Ewald thinks),—(for which interpretation the analogy may be adduced where the synagogue of God is converted into the synagogue of Satan);—or whether they really boasted that they knew the depths of Satan, and hence could tell how to combat Satan aright, that they could conquer him by pride and contempt,—that they could indulge in sensual pleasures, and maintain the composure of their spirit unaltered,—that the inner man might attain such strength that it was no longer moved by what weaker souls, who were still under the servitude of the law and to whom the power of Satan was so fearful, anxiously shunned,—and thus could put Satan to scorn even in his own domains.

‡ On no supposition are we justified in confounding this Nicolaus with the well-known deacon of this name. But on the supposition named, it is more probable that the Nicolaitanes of the second century originated from this sect.

germinating, Gnostic Antinomianism must have called for the most scrupulous adherence to the decrees of the apostolic convention at Jerusalem. The greater freedom which the apostle Paul had approved in theory, here took so mischievous an Antinomian direction, as to throw suspicion on that freedom itself. Thus in the whole of the following age, the unscrupulous eating of the flesh offered in sacrifices was regarded as a mark of Gnostic Antinomianism.*

With these practical errors were connected various theoretic tendencies of a false gnosis, which, in mutual conflict with one another, had extended more widely since the close of the Pauline age. We have noticed in the church at Colossæ the adherents of a Judaizing gnosis, who probably set a high value on Judaism as a revelation from God communicated by angels, attached a perpetual value to it as well as to Christianity, and pretended that they possessed peculiar information respecting the various classes of angels. To this Jewish angel-worship, Paul opposes the doctrine of Jesus as the Son of God, the one head of the church of God, on whom angels also are dependent, the common head of that universal church to which men and angels belong. He extols him as the being who has triumphed over all the powers which would make man dependent on themselves, over all the powers that set themselves in opposition to the kingdom of God, so that men need no longer fear them. From the subordination of these powers he then infers the high dignity and freedom of the redeemed through Christ, the children of God, who are become companions of angels in the kingdom of God. But this elevated doctrine of the dignity and freedom of Christians was perverted by those who confronted the limited Jewish conceptions by a bold Antinomian gnosis, and affirmed that Judaism was to be despised as the work of limited spirits; that the sons of God were more than these spirits and exalted above their maxims. They thought themselves sufficiently exalted to scorn these higher powers, and to ridicule all law as a work of these limited and limiting powers. With this was connected that reckless immoral tendency which we have before noticed, and which presented itself in opposition to the legal asceticism which we find connected with the Judaizing gnosis in the church at Colossæ. This is the tendency which is combated on the side of its

* In this way we can account for it that Justin Martyr, who, by Baur and his school, is set down as an Ebionite, although we cannot mistake in him the influence of the doctrinal system of the Pauline epistles and of the Gospel of John opposes those who maintained that the eating of flesh offered in sacrifice was harmless. And we know not how Schwegeler (i. p. 175) can find in the passage referring to the subject in *Dial. c. Tryph.* f. 253, *ed. Colon.* an attack on the adherents of the Pauline doctrine, or a mode of thinking directed against the apostle Paul himself. If it is to be concluded that what Justin says contradicts Pauline principles, and that he himself, consciously and designedly, was an opponent of Paul, then many of the Fathers who often cite Paul, must be regarded as anti-Pauline Ebionites. But this construction can with less reason be put on that passage, since Justin, in the words that follow soon after, but which are not quoted by Schwegeler, shows against whom he is speaking, namely, the Gnostics.

blended theoretical and practical errors, in the warning Epistle of Jude, addressed probably to the Christians in these parts.* We see here how, from the Pauline ideas carried out with one-sided extravagance and thus distorted into error, the gnostic doctrine was educed of the opposition between Christianity as the revelation of the Son, and Judaism as the revelation of the Demiurgus and his angels. These two opposite tendencies of gnosis developed themselves in this age in various minglings and transitions.

The Judaizing gnosis found its representative in Cerinthus, who forms the transition both from the common, stiff, carnal Judaism to Gnosticism, and from the common limited Jewish mode of thinking, which retained only the human in Christ, to the gnostic which acknowledged only the Divine in him, only the ideal Christ.† He agreed also with the common Jewish view of the Messiah in this respect, that he considered Jesus as a mere man, that he denied the original indwelling of the divine Being in him, and treated the entrance of the Divine into his life as something sudden, by which, at his solemn inauguration, he was made capable of discharging his calling as the Messiah. But Cerinthus differed from the common Jewish notions, in that, in place of a peculiar inworking of the divine power, by which the man Jesus was fitted for his Messianic office,

* This is, for the most part, the view developed by Schneckenburger in his work before mentioned. As to the author of this epistle, he evidently distinguishes himself from the apostles, when he speaks of the prophetic warnings of the apostles (v. 17), such as we certainly find in Paul's writings; we cannot explain the passage otherwise without doing violence to it. The description of the state of the church is also such as suits only the end of the apostolic age. It is therefore evident, that, if the epistle be genuine, it cannot have been written by an *apostle* Jude, who was a brother of James. It would likewise have been more natural in this case, to have designated himself an apostle, instead of calling himself a brother of James. Hence we should rather suppose him to have been Jude, one of the brethren of the Lord. But why should he not call himself a brother of the Lord, instead of "brother of James," since the designation was for the very purpose of adding weight to his warnings through personal authority. It may be said that he omitted this title through humility. But is this answer satisfactory? By the addition of various epithets, as brother according to the flesh, ἀδελφὸς κατὰ σάρκα, and servant of Jesus Christ according to the Spirit, δοῦλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κατὰ πνεῦμα, he might have prevented all misunderstanding, and removed all appearance of arrogance. A similar objection may indeed be made in reference to James, who, in his epistle, does not designate himself a brother of the Lord. But here the case is altogether different. James does not distinguish himself by any epithet expressive of consanguinity,—not out of humility but because he deemed it to be the highest honor to be a servant of God and of Christ. We may suppose another Jude as well as another James, since the name Jude was so frequent among the Jews, and since, according to Hegesippus, there were many distinguished men of this name in the church. But as the epithet "brother of James" is used here as a distinction, it is most natural to refer it to that James who was held in such high esteem. It might be said that he described himself only as the brother of James, because James was so pre-eminent, and was accustomed to be designated as a brother of the Lord. But the manner in which elsewhere in the New Testament the brethren of Christ are named together, does not favor this view of the matter.

† See my Church History, vol. i. p. 396.

he supposed a new animation by the highest Spirit emanating from God, and forming the connexion between God and the Creation, the divine Logos. This Spirit, representing itself in sensible appearance under the form of a Dove, as a usual symbol of the Divine Spirit, had settled upon him at his baptism; he had revealed through him the hidden Supreme God, the knowledge of whom among the Jews had been the privilege of only a small number of enlightened persons,* through him he had performed miracles, but before the last sufferings of Jesus had withdrawn from him, and left him to himself. As Cerinthus in this manner held no original and indissoluble unity between the Logos (the Messiah and Redeemer in a special sense) and the Humanity of Jesus, but only a transient relation, a connexion suddenly formed and as suddenly dissolved, he thus granted only a very subordinate place to the purely human in Christ. According to this view, the man Jesus was only an accidental vehicle, of which the redeeming Spirit, the Logos, made use, in order to be able to reveal himself in humanity; could the Logos without this medium have made himself cognisable and perceptible to men, he would not have made use of such an organ as the man Jesus. From the same tendency, but more rudely presented, proceeded another view, according to which it was believed, that a revelation of the Logos might be made in humanity without any such mediation as a human existence, which it was wished to dispense with. In place of the real human appearance of Christ, only a semblance, a phantom was substituted in which the Logos was enshrined. Everything that came under the notice of the senses was explained as only a phantom, an optical illusion, of which the higher ethereal Being, who from his nature could not be perceptible to the senses, made use, that he might manifest himself to sensuous mortals. A theory which already had been used for the explanation of theophanies and angelophanies in the Old Testament,† was applied by those who held these views to the appearance and life of Christ. At his transfiguration, said they, Christ manifested himself, without that sensible appearance, to his disciples, who were rendered for the time capable of beholding him in his true ethereal form.‡

* The genuine *θεραπευταί*.

† As, for example, Philo on Exod. xxiv., where the subject is the appearance of the divine "glory," *δόξα*, which may be understood partly of the appearance of the angels by whom God revealed himself, partly of the symbolical appearances under which God represented himself to the perceptions of men; *τῇ δοκῇσει αὐτοῦ μόνου καὶ ὑπολήψει δόξης θείας, ὡς ἐντειργύσθαι ταῖς τῶν παρόντων διανοίαις φαντασίαν ἀφίξεως θεοῦ, ὡς ἡκοντος εἰς βεβαιωτάτην πίστιν τῶν μελλόντων νομοθετεῖσθαι*, (in order that men might have the firm conviction that what was revealed to them proceeded from God, he therefore so operated on their consciousness, that they believed that they saw Himself.) *Τοῦ θεοῦ δεικνύντος ὑπερ ἐβούλετο δοκεῖν εἶναι, πρὸς τὴν τῶν θεωμένων κατάπληξιν, μὴ ὦν τοῦτο ὑπερ ἐφαίνετο* (God shewed what he chose to seem to be, for the amazement of beholders, not being that which he appeared.)—*Philonis Opera*, ed. Lips. 1829, vol. vi. p. 245.

‡ A pure spiritual intuition was something wholly foreign to such persons. Light and spirit were one and the same thing to them!

Against such persons John was now called to defend the announcement of "Jesus Christ in the flesh." We have no reason for calling in question the traditions respecting his conflicts with Cerinthus. Irenæus, amongst others, mentions as an account given by the aged Polycarp, that on one occasion when John was about to bathe, and heard that Cerinthus was in the bathing-house; he retired with abhorrence, and exclaimed, "Surely the house will fall in ruins, since the enemy of the truth is there!" We can perfectly reconcile it with his character, and find in it nothing unapostolic, if, in a momentary ebullition of feelings naturally lively and ardent,* proceeding from holy zeal, he expressed in such strong terms (in which, nevertheless, everything is not to be taken quite literally) his displeasure against a man who threatened to rob the churches, over whose salvation he was watching with fatherly care, of what was dearest and holiest to him, the foundation on which his whole Christianity rested, and to destroy the root of the Christian life; still the pledge for the credibility of this anecdote is very slight, and it may be easily attributed to an extravagant hatred of heretics.† But the antagonism of the Apostle John and Cerinthus, is, in any case an undeniable fact, and only the greatest arbitrariness could place Cerinthus in another relation to John, namely, make out of him the representative of a spirit akin to that of the Apostle.‡

According to a widely spread, ancient tradition, the Apostle John was

* We must not allow ourselves to imagine, that the apostle, by the sanctifying influence of the Divine Spirit, was at once dis severed from all connexion with his former natural character, as well as from the peculiar phraseology of his countrymen; we must, with Jerome, recognise in the apostle, *homo adhuc vasculo clausus infirmo*, (a man inclosed as yet in an imperfect vessel).

† Irenæus did not receive this account in his youth from the lips of Polycarp, but could only appeal for the truth of it to what others had heard from Polycarp, iii. 3, *ἐκ τῶν οἱ ἀκηκοότες αὐτοῦ*. The question then is, whether the persons who reported it to Irenæus are trustworthy. We know, indeed, that much of what Irenæus reports as tradition, bears on it the impress of falsehood. Thus he himself, ii. 24, appeals to the testimony of all the presbyters in Lesser Asia, who had been in the society of the apostle John, that Jesus was about fifty years old. The difficulty involved in this, does not appear to me so easily removed as Credner maintains in his *Einleitung*, p. 215. The tradition of the presbyters, according to the report of Irenæus, certainly appears not to have been that Jesus first entered on his office as teacher at the commencement of that riper mature age, which was required by the Jewish customs for assuming such an office, but he received from their own lips the deposition that Christ had taught at an age which was beyond the *ætas juvenilis*, and approached to the *senilis*. If the passage is genuine in all its extent, he expressly distinguished this age from the *ætas perfecta magistri*, which was well known to him, in which Christ first appeared in Jerusalem as a teacher. From his words, therefore, we must deduce such a tradition as he supposed he had received from the presbyters. But we can hardly suppress the suspicion of interpolation; for however little we are justified in depending on the critical judgment of Irenæus, we cannot reconcile it to a man of his powerful mind, that he, who had shortly before said that Christ had spent three years, from the beginning of his thirtieth year to his death, in his office of teaching, could afterwards attribute twenty years more to him.

‡ As Schweigler has done, II. p. 259.

banished to the island of Patmos, in the Ægean Sea, by one of the emperors who was hostile to the Christians, but which of them is not ascertained.* Only Irenæus leads us to suppose that Domitian was the emperor, for he says† that John, at the end of Domitian's reign, received revelations, which he afterwards committed to writing; and since, according to the Apocalypse, this must have happened in the Isle of Patmos whither he had been banished, it follows that he was sentenced by that emperor. But owing to the uncertainty of the traditions of that age, we cannot acknowledge this account as sufficiently accredited; it is indeed possible, that it proceeded only from a peculiar interpretation of this obscure book, and not from any historical testimony. And if the Apocalypse contains certain marks of having been written before this time, this opinion would at once cease to be tenable. As this is really the case, then certainly the Apocalypse, which we cannot acknowledge as a work of the apostle,‡ must have been written soon after the death

* See Tertull. Præscript. c. 36. Clemens, Qui dives salv. c. 42, speaks of the return of John from exile, "the tyrant having died," τοῦ τυράννου τελευτήσαντος, without specifying any name. Origen, t. xvi. in Matt § 6, also uses the indefinite expression, "the king of the Romans," ὁ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεύς.

† V. 30.

‡ We refer, on this subject, to the celebrated work of Dr. Lücke, *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannes*. Bonn, 1832, (An Attempt at a Complete Introduction to the Revelation of John.) We certainly cannot acknowledge this book as the work of the apostle, but it bears witness to the existence of a Johannean doctrinal type, just as the Epistle to the Hebrews could not proceed from the apostle Paul, but indicates that its author was a person who enjoyed close intimacy with the apostle. We reckon among these marks, the agreement in the doctrine of the Logos, which no refinements can remove, (i. 17; iii. 14; xix. 30;) the designation of *living waters*, (vii. 17;) and several other things in the perhaps excessively symbolical expressions. Notwithstanding the strongly marked Jewish element, there breathes throughout the book a spirit quite different from the Ebionitish, such a spirit as could not have issued from the impure elements of that age without the creative breath of the transforming Spirit of Christ. Who can help acknowledging this in the description of the exaltation of glorified believers, and of their salvation, in the seventh chapter; of the glory of the perfected theocracy in the one-and-twentieth chapter; in the representation of the universal priesthood; and in the Apocalyptic epistles? The literal interpretation of the imagery which would give us a sensuous Chiliasm, would refute itself through the self-contradictory representations that would spring from it. We find in the book no traces whatever of Jewish nationality, or of a special distinction of Christians of Jewish descent; for if 144,000 chosen out of the twelve tribes are mentioned in ch. vii. 4, yet, an innumerable multitude of glorified saints out of all nations and tongues are immediately afterwards described. And in ch. xiv. 3, the 144,000 appear again as the first-fruits of Christians out of all nations, as the most advanced in the Christian life, from which contradiction of the first-named statement, it may seem that such designations in this book are not to be taken exactly according to the letter. Lastly, in the interpretation of this latter passage, I cannot agree with what Bleek has lately suggested, that only those persons are here pointed out who had kept themselves free from all the lewdness connected with heathenism. If only this had been intended, it would hardly have been brought forward so prominently by the author. In this passage I can only find those persons represented who led a single life in undivided devotedness to the Lord alone, to whom their whole life was consecrated. Of any polemic

of Nero.* The whole account of the banishment of the apostle John to the Isle of Patmos may have been taken chiefly from the Apocalypse, and if this book can be shown not to belong to John, the credibility of this account at once falls to the ground. Yet here two cases are possible. If the Apocalypse proceeded from another John than the apostle, if it was the composition of the Presbyter John who was his contemporary at Ephesus,† the banishment to the Isle of Patmos would relate

tone directed against the apostle Paul not a trace can be found in the book; it cannot be taken as a proof of this tone, that in ch. xxi. 14, according to the twelve tribes of the theocratic people, only twelve apostles are mentioned as the foundation of the New Jerusalem. I must rather agree with Bleek that these words are rather against, than for, the notion that the author wished to be regarded as one of the apostles, of which no mark exists from which it could be inferred. And if it is remarkable that any other person than the apostle John should designate himself so simply as the servant of Jesus Christ, and write with such confidence and emphasis to the churches, it is to be taken into consideration, that in the vision granted him he might believe he had received a call to write in such a tone, even if his own personal position did not give him this importance in the Christian church. And if he himself had been an immediate disciple of the Lord, this alone would have secured him special authority.

* We remark in this book, the vivid impression which Nero's persecution of the Christians, his burning of a part of the city of Rome, and especially his cruelties, had made on the minds of men. The story that Nero was not really dead, but had retired to the Euphrates, and would return again from thence (see my Church History, i. 96), appears here more fully delineated by a Christian imagination. He is the monster to whom Satan gave all his power, who returns as anti-christ and the destroyer of Rome, who will force all to worship his image. The Roman empire at that time is set forth as the representative of heathenism, and of ungodly power personified, and in this connexion, under the image of the beast with seven heads (the seven Roman emperors which would succeed one another till the appearance of anti-christ), Nero is signified as one of these heads (xiii. 3), which appeared dead, but whose deadly wound was healed, so that to universal astonishment he appeared alive again. Nero reappearing after it had been believed that he was dead, is the beast "which was, and is not, and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit—and yet is," Rev. xvii. 8. Of the seven emperors who were to reign until the appearance of anti-christ, it is said that five have fallen—one (Nero's successor) is now reigning, and the other is not yet come; and when he comes, he must remain only a short time, and the beast which was and is not, is itself the eighth and one of the seven; (Nero as one of the seven emperors is the fifth, but inasmuch as he comes again as anti-christ, and founds the last universal monarchy following the succession of the seven emperors, he is the eighth.) Nero comes from the East, supported by his tributaries—the ten kings (his Satraps, the ten horns of the beast) leagued with him to destroy Rome, and to make war on Christianity. The waters of the Euphrates are dried up, to make a way for Nero with his ten Satraps, xvi. 12, who, in his service, would burn and destroy Rome, xvii. 16. All this marks the time in which the Apocalypse must have been written, the change of the emperor after Nero, while the image of this monster was yet in vivid recollection, and men were disposed to depict the future in magnified images of the past; it also agrees with this date, that the temple at Jerusalem is described as still in existence, i. 1, therefore it must be before the year 70. The future and the past comprehended within the limits of time lie before the prophetic eye of the author near to each other. The image of the future which hovers before the eye of his inspiration presents itself to him in the reflex of the past and the present. When he, for example, speaks of kings and peoples out of many tongues who have confessed themselves Christians, this cannot suit the time then present.

† If the Presbyter John were the author, the early substitution of the apostle of the

to him, and not to the apostle of this name. And this change, by which the Apocalypse was attributed to the apostle, would have occasioned also the report of his banishment to this island, although it is possible that the same outward causes might have led to the banishment of both these distinguished teachers of the *religio illicita*. But if we admit that another person wished to represent these revelations as those which the apostle John had received, and if we hence infer, that in order to personate John, he made use of certain passages in his life, then the words in i. 9, in case they are to be understood of a banishment to the Isle of Patmos,* yet always presuppose the fact of such an exile of the apostle, and we must in this case place his banishment in the first period after his arrival in Lesser Asia. But it is possible that, independently of the Apocalypse, there might have been a tradition that the apostle John was banished by the Emperor Domitian (in whose reign such banishments to the islands on account of passing over to Judaism or Christianity were not uncommon) to the Isle of Patmos or some other island; and it is possible that, from this tradition, the supposition was formed that the Apocalypse ascribed to the apostle was written during this period. Certainly we cannot refuse to believe the unanimous tradition of the Asiatic churches in the second century, that the apostle John, as a teacher of those churches, had to suffer on account of the faith, for which reason he was distinguished as a martyr in the above quoted epistle of Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus.†

same name might be very easily explained. It would easily happen that the other John would be forgotten for the apostle, and particularly since a book which announced itself as prophetic would create reverence for itself from its character, there would be less disposition to doubt that the author who styles himself John was the apostle. Lastly, it is worthy of observation that Polycrates, in Eusebius v. 24, where he quotes all John's titles of honor, does not distinguish him as a prophet, although such a predicate, if he believed that he could employ it, must have availed much. The position of the words in the most ancient testimony for the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, in *Justin M. Dial. c. Tryph. Jud. l. 380*, is very striking. 'Επειδὴ καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν ἀνὴρ τις, ὃ ὄνομα Ἰωάννης, εἰς τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ Χριστοῦ προεφήτευσεν, &c. (Afterwards also among us, a certain man, whose name was John, one of the apostles of Christ, prophesied, &c.) If we do not venture to regard the words, "one of the apostles," εἰς τῶν ἀποστόλων, as an interpolation, though examples of such interpolations might be pointed out elsewhere in the book, yet all that is absolutely certain amounts to this, that the Apocalypse proceeded from a person of the name of John; and that this was the apostle, Justin might have inferred even from the name. This is the best explanation of what is remarkable in the position of the words.

* Here everything depends on the interpretation of the words in Rev. i. 9. There is no necessary reference to sufferings on account of the gospel. The words may be understood thus: "I was in the Isle of Patmos, for the purpose of publishing the word of God and testifying of Christ;" which would be only saying that John had visited that island for the sake of publishing the gospel, or that he had gone thither in order that a divine revelation should there be communicated to him, and he should be able to testify of that which Christ had revealed to him; in this way verse 2d will be best understood, and the "companion in tribulation," συγκοινωνὸς ἐν τῇ θλίψει, need not necessarily be referred to the banishment to Patmos.

† The words of the epistle in Euseb. v. 24, and quoted above, καὶ μάρτυς καὶ διδάσκαλος τὸτος ἐν Ἐφέσῳ κεκοίμηται. (Both a martyr and a teacher; he fell asleep at Ephesus.)

As in those regions where the general superintendence of the church devolved on John, manifold controversial attempts were made to adulterate the Christian faith, as well as to disturb and suppress the spirit of Christian love, it was the main object of his protracted labors to maintain and propagate the essence of the Christian faith and of Christian love, in opposition to these destructive influences. Of this fact his writings bear witness, which, as they were produced under such circumstances, give indications of their tendency even where they are not professedly and intentionally polemical. But as his natural character was rather contemplative than argumentative, the controversial element in his writings is not so decidedly indicated, nor developed with so definite and complete an outline as in the dialectic Paul. His controversial style is more that of simple affirmation: from the fulness of his heart he testifies his inmost convictions of the basis of salvation, and he only marks occasionally, and points out with abhorrence, the opposite of these convictions, instead of entering into a full confutation. This especially applies to his Gospel. Since he wrote it among churches and for churches among which a multitude of traditions respecting the history of Christ, oral and written, must long have been in circulation, (Paul had already assumed the existence of these and accommodated himself to them,) he could not do otherwise in his historical representations than take these circumstances into account, and hence would give only such a selection from the evangelical history as appeared to him precisely the best fitted to represent Jesus as the Son of God, from whom alone men could receive eternal life, and to transfer to others the impression which the contemplation of his life had made upon himself, as he declares at the close of his gospel, where he says, "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book. But these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing (by the virtue of this faith) ye might have life (true, divine, eternal life) through his name," (through him as the Son of God); xx. 30, 31. John accordingly made exactly this selection from the evangelical history in order to lead men to this faith; to aid, strengthen, and uphold them in maintaining it. As in the application of the idea of faith in John there were various shades of meaning, all these varieties may be included in the words "that ye may believe;" and as they are all embraced in the apostle's design, those polemic references must be understood which belong to the maintenance and confirmation of the faith under such circumstances. And the delineation of the life of Christ in its unity, as it proceeded from the heart and mind of John, must of itself have been fitted to form a barrier against all those tendencies which disturbed the purity of Christianity. But because this species of polemic, which inheres in the subject itself, predominates through the peculiarity of John and the peculiar nature of his Gospel, it can by no means be hence shown from the Gospel itself, that he intended to bring specially to view certain definite controversies. Even those which, from his pe-

culiar scene of labor, we might consider as most probably aimed at, cannot be ascertained from the Gospel itself by any fair deduction; as, for example, the declaration "the Word was made flesh," ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, which occurs in the introduction, and thus marks the spirit of the whole development of his history in so far as it describes the revelation of the divine life in human form, is peculiarly suited to form a refutation of the Cerinthian gnosis. But there is no indication that John made this refutation a leading object of his Gospel. In his narrative of Christ's baptism, he might have had a strong inducement to bring forward this controversy, as Cerinthus had affixed a peculiar interpretation to this event, in accordance with his general scheme. But in order to combat Cerinthus, he must have commenced the history of Christ at an earlier period, and have adduced those conspicuous marks of the Divine, which accompanied the birth of Christ. So also, though the manner in which the purely human in Christ is developed throughout the Gospel, is most decidedly opposed to Docetism, yet we can find in it no trace of a designed and continuous refutation of that heresy. "The Word was made flesh," is not in the least suited to this purpose, for, taken by itself, it may be fairly understood in the docetic sense, that the "Word" itself became "flesh," since Docetism considered "flesh" only as the apparent sensuous guise in which the "Word" presented itself to eyes of sense. From this point of view it might with propriety be affirmed that the "Word" became "flesh," or presented itself in the form of "flesh." And in what John says of the flowing of water and blood from Christ's side, it has been very erroneously attempted to find a refutation of Docetism. This argumentation cannot affect the Docetæ, for they would be as ready to allow that the Roman soldier and John saw the blood and water flowing, as to grant that Jesus presented himself to the senses of men in his life and passion as narrated in the evangelical history. They only denied the objective reality of the sensuous perceptions, and this denial would apply to one fact as well as to another. But John mentions it in that connexion simply as a sign of the reality of Christ's death, in order thereby to establish faith in the reality of his resurrection from the dead.

It is only in the introduction to his Gospel that John appears to design a special reference to men of any peculiar mental tendency among his contemporaries; a reference to those who busied themselves with speculations respecting the Logos as the Mediator between the hidden God and the creation,—and to this class those now belonged, who, after they had professed Christianity, threatened to adulterate it by mingling with it their former speculations. It cannot indeed be denied that John, independently of any outward reference, might have been induced, by his Christian consciousness and by what Christ had declared respecting himself, to name him simply as the Logos. As Christ represents his word or words (his λόγος, his ῥήματα, his φωνή) as the word of God himself, that thereby alone God reveals himself to men, the fountain of life, the

word of life; so John might thereby be induced to designate him as the Word, which is God, (the self-revealing Divine Being simply,) the Word, the Source of life*; and also the reference to a word of God, by which God already in the Old Testament had revealed himself, might here attach itself, to point out a preparation in the Old Testament for the revelation of the Divine Being in Christ. Meanwhile, the manner in which John places this Word without further definition at the head of his whole representation, makes it probable that, although he was perhaps led to the choice of this expression from within, since he sought for a new designation for a new idea, yet he connected with it an idea already existing, and the train of thought with which he opens his Gospel serves to establish this opinion. John wished to lead those who busied themselves with speculations respecting the Logos as the medium of all communicated life from God and of every revelation of God, the central point of all the theophanies, from their religious idealism to a religious realism, to the acknowledgment of God revealed in Christ—to the consciousness that the Logos, as the divine fountain of life, had appropriated human nature, and through it communicated himself as the fountain of all true life and light to every one who believed in his human appearance. Instead of wishing to investigate the hidden which no human mind can penetrate, he called on every one to contemplate Him who had revealed himself in human nature—to believe and experience what he testified he had himself seen and experienced.

The whole development of the church from the time of Justin Martyr testifies to the existence of such a Gospel which operated powerfully on men's minds. Its existence cannot be explained from any single mental tendency in the following age, nor from the amalgamation of several tendencies. Indeed, it existed as a representation of a higher unity, as a reconciling element to the contrarieties of that age, and could exert an attractive power over minds so opposite as those of Heracleon, Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus, and Tertullian. Where could we in that age find a man who was raised above its contrarieties by which all were more or less affected? And would a man of so superior a Christian spirit have crept on in the dark and made use of such a mask, instead of appearing openly in the consciousness of all-conquering truth and with a feeling of his mental superiority? A man, so exalted above all the church teachers of that century, need not have shrunk from the conflict. He must certainly have placed more confidence in the power of truth than in these arts of darkness and falsehood. And how can it be shown, that such a man, if we contemplate him in the light of his own age, would have been

* See the remarks of Dr. Lange of Jena in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1830, part iii. And this view does not necessarily depend on the otherwise forced explanations of John's introduction, into which the worthy author—an author whom on account of his Christian-theological character I hold in the highest esteem—has been led by his peculiar dogmatic system.

restrained by no reverence for sacred history, by no scruple, from falsifying a history, the contents of which were holy to him, through arbitrary fictions for a definite purpose, through actual falsehoods which must find their justification in their object? And how imprudently he must have acted if, in order to attain his object, he presented the history of Christ in a manner which stood in diametric opposition to universal tradition! Truly only from an apostle who stood in such relation to Christ as John did, who had received into his own breast the impression and image of that unique personality, could proceed a work which stands in such relation to the contrarieties of the post-apostolic age! It is a thoroughly immediate production, and was cast in a single mould. The divine in its own immediate essence contains this power of composing differences; but never could such a fresh, originally powerful production proceed from a designed, cleverly constructed composition of differences. The Gospel of John, if it did not proceed from the apostle John and point to that Christ, a beholding of whom gave birth to it, would be the greatest of enigmas.

In the circular pastoral letter, which is distinguished as the first of his Catholic Epistles, the apostle presents himself to us under a fatherly relation to the churches of Lesser Asia, whose concerns, during his residence at Ephesus, he regulated with wakeful anxiety. Lücke has justly remarked, that the hortatory or paracletical element is by far the most conspicuous in it, and the polemical holds a very subordinate place, which agrees with John's peculiar style.* This epistle contains an admonition to the churches, to preserve the original faith steadfastly and truly under the manifold temptations which threatened them both from Jews and Gentiles, as well as from those various classes of false teachers before mentioned—and it exhorts the churches to a course of life corresponding to their faith, while it warns against a formal Christianity, destitute of the true Christian spirit, and against a false confidence grounded upon it. When we think of the churches in Lesser Asia, in the transition from the Pauline age to that of John, as we have described their state in the preceding pages, we shall probably be wholly unable (since they were exposed to manifold, diversified conflicts from within and without, and to dangers of various kinds) to find a unity in the hortatory and controversial references, nor can we point out such a unity in the contents of the epistle itself without a forced or too subtle an interpretation. Many passages may appear to be exhortations to steadfastness in the faith, amidst the allurements to unfaithfulness, or to apostasy presented by the outward enemies of the church, both Jews and Gentiles. As to apostasy, there were reasons for such exhortations, as the Christians were still closely connected by so many ties to the Gentile world; new members were added continually to the Christian communities from the Gentiles, whose

* This epistle is, in the apostolic sense, a "word of exhortation," λόγος παρακλήσεως.

faith required confirmation ; and, since the first Neronian persecution,* individual persecutions were constantly repeated, which were dangerous to the weak in faith. Under the same head may be classed the exhortation at the close of the epistle, faithfully to preserve the knowledge of the true God revealed through Christ as the source of eternal life, and to keep themselves from all contact with idolatry. As respects temptations to unfaithfulness, the churches in Lesser Asia for the most part consisted of persons of Gentile descent, but mixed with these were former proselytes, and individual Jews, who formed a point of connexion, by which the Jews could exert an influence on the churches, the same as may be noticed in the Christian communities of the Pauline and even of the Ignatian period. It might also seem, that when John combated persons who refused to acknowledge Jesus as the Messiah, he intended Jewish adversaries ; but a closer examination will suggest several objections to this view. As in accordance with the prophetic expressions in the discourses of Christ himself, it was expected that a special revelation of the anti-christian spirit would precede the triumph of the kingdom of God, which was to be effected by the second coming of Christ, so John recognised as a mark of this approaching crisis, that many organs of this anti-christian spirit had already made their appearance. Now this could not refer to Jewish adversaries, for these from the very first were never wanting. The apostle moreover says of them, "They have gone out from the midst of us, but they belonged not in disposition to us ; for had they belonged in disposition to us, they would have remained with us ; but by their outward separation from us, it became manifest that not all who belonged outwardly to us belonged to us also inwardly." This may indeed be understood of those who, while they still made a profession of Christianity, were always in their disposition more inclined to Judaism, so that at last they openly passed over to it, and became the opponents of Christianity. But such frequent conversions or apostasies to Judaism in the churches of Lesser Asia, at this period, were by no means probable. It is more natural to think of those members of Christian communities, who had fostered in their bosoms heretical tendencies foreign to Christianity, which must have at last resulted in their open separation from the churches. With justice, John says of a time like this, in which churches were formed out of various mental elements not all in an equal measure attracted and penetrated by Christianity, that whatever portion was actually animated by the Christian spirit, must be separated, by a refining process proceeding from the life of the church itself, from what was only superficially affected by Christianity, and wore the mere semblance of it. Besides the manner in which the apostle exhorts believers to hold fast the doctrine announced to them

* If we do not directly admit that this epistle was written in the last part of the Johannean period, under the Emperor Nerva.

from the beginning—his saying to them that they required no further instruction to put them on their guard against the spread of those errors—that they need only to be referred to the anointing of the Holy Spirit already received, to their indwelling Christian consciousness (ii. 22)—all this rather imports an opposition to false teachers, than to decided adversaries of the gospel, who could not be so dangerous to believers.

Although John describes his opponents as those who did not acknowledge Jesus as the Messiah, yet, according to the remarks just made, this cannot be understood of *decided unbelieving* opponents of the Messianic dignity of Jesus. And we must explain this shorter description of his opponents by the longer, according to which they are represented as those who would not acknowledge the incarnate Christ, or who would not recognize Jesus as the Messiah manifest in the flesh. Therefore, with their Docetic views they would not receive the annunciation of a Messiah appearing in the flesh; the reality of the living, acting, and suffering Christ in the form of earthly human nature.* And since John could not separate the divine and the human in the person and life of the Redeemer from one another, for both had revealed themselves to him as inseparable in the unity of the appearance of the Son of God,—it appeared to him, that whoever did not acknowledge Jesus as the Son of God in the whole unity and completeness of his divine-human life, did not truly believe in Jesus as the Son of God, the Messiah; and since only thus the eternal divine source of life revealed itself in human nature and imparted itself to men, and a way to communion with God was thereby alone opened for all,—it appeared to him that whoever denied the reality of the revelation of the divine Logos in the flesh, denied the Son of God himself and the Father also. This was the real anti-Christian spirit of falsehood, which, though connecting itself in appearance with the Christian profession, in fact threatened to destroy faith in the Son, and in the Father as revealed in the Son.

In a passage which is rather practical and hortatory than controversial, where John, for the purpose of exhortation, lays down the position that faith in Jesus as the Son of God arms with power for all conflicts with the world, he adds, "Jesus is he who has revealed himself as the Messiah by water† and by blood,—by means of the baptism received

* If it be objected, as by Lange in his *Beiträge zur ältesten Kirchengeschichte*, Leipzig, 1828, p. 121, that if John designed the confutation of Docetism, he would have expressed himself in some precise terms, such as we find in the Epistles of Ignatius; the answer is, that it is John's favorite method not to mark the object of controversy more distinctly and fully.

† As the "came by blood" relates to Jesus subjectively, to the one who had revealed himself by his own sufferings, so also the second clause, "came by water," is most naturally referred to something affecting Jesus personally, and, therefore, not to the baptism instituted by him. This reason is not perfectly decisive, for, if the sufferings of Christ are not contemplated in their subjective aspect, (that is, simply in relation to Jesus as the sufferer,) but rather in their objective aspect, as redeeming sufferings, as that by which Christ effected the salvation of mankind, then the coming by water might fitly

from him* and by means of his redeeming sufferings; and that which the Spirit of God, whose witness is infallible, has effected, and still effects, by him, testifies the same. The threefold witness of the water, the blood, and the Spirit, thus unite to verify the same."

It is possible that John in this passage collected such marks as appeared to him most striking, which distinguished Jesus as the Son of God, without any special controversial reference. But it is also possible that he connected a polemical with a parenetical design, and therefore was induced to bring together precisely these marks; and in this case it would be certainly most natural to suppose an intended contradiction of the Cerinthian view, which separated the Christ who appeared at the Baptism from the crucified Jesus.

This epistle, then, contains an impressive appeal against the practical adulterations of Christianity. The apostle declares that only he who practices righteousness is born of God,—that a life in communion with Christ and a life of sin are irreconcilable,—that whoever lives in sin is far from knowing him; whoever commits sin transgresses also the law, and sin is actually a transgression of the law. From this contrast it might be inferred that the false gnosis here combated had produced and confirmed practical errors; and we may believe that we here find traces of the false liberalism and antinomianism of the later gnosis, such as we have pointed out above, p. 361, in many appearances of this age. In this case his opponents would be only those who opposed the ethical in the form of law, and said, What you call sin appears so only to those who are still enthralled in legal bondage; we must give proof of our being free from the law by not regarding such commands. But if John

denote the institution of baptism, which is necessarily required for completing the redeeming work of Christ. But what Lücke in his Commentary, 2d ed. p. 288, has urged against the view I have taken, does not appear pertinent. The Messiah (he thinks) was to be inducted to his office by a solemn inauguration. This was performed through John as the appointed prophet by means of the Messianic baptism. Hence the coming by water is placed first, by which Jesus at first revealed himself as the Messiah, and from which his whole public Messianic ministry dates its commencement. This must have been peculiarly important in John's estimation, who was first led to Christ by the testimony of the Baptist. On the contrary, I believe that if he had meant the baptism instituted by Christ, he would have placed first the "coming by blood," for I cannot agree with what Lücke says in p. 291: "Precisely on this account was it, because 'water' denotes, as it were, only the beginning of purification, while the full purification lies in the 'blood,' that John emphatically adds, 'not by water only,' (with which alone John the Baptist appeared, and therefore was not the Messiah, Matt. iii. 11), 'but by water and by blood.'" The baptism of Christ was in the apostle's view altogether different from that of John. With it was connected complete purification. Water-baptism and Spirit-baptism cannot here be separated from one another, and this Christian baptism necessarily presupposes the redeeming sufferings of Christ. See Ephes. v. 25, 26. As far as Cerinthus acknowledged the Messiah only as "coming by water," not as "coming by blood," this would agree with a designed opposition to his doctrine.

* On account of the importance which is attributed to it in the Gospel of John, in reference to the unveiling of the Messiah's dignity and the hidden glory of Jesus.

had been called to oppose such a gross antinomianism, he would have had to maintain against it the dignity and holiness of the law, and would have given his polemic a very different direction, indeed quite the reverse. He must have said, Whoever transgresses the law, commits sin, and the transgression of the law is sin. Also from his saying, "Whoever sinneth, knoweth not Christ," it by no means follows that those against whom he is writing, taught a gnosis of immoral tendency. Nor is it at all clear that the practical errors which he combated proceeded from a peculiar theoretic source; nothing more was needed for their production than that unchristian tendency which would naturally spring up, especially in churches that had been for some time established, in which Christianity had passed from parents to children, and become a matter of custom, and a tendency to reliance on the *opus operatum* of faith and of outward profession, *faith not being apprehended as an animating principle of the inward life*. In opposition to such a tendency, which disowned the claims of Christianity on the whole of life, and palliated immorality, the apostle says, "Whoever lives in sin, whatever be his pretensions, is far from knowing Jesus Christ; all sin is a transgression of the divine law, which in its whole extent is sacred to the Christian."

The view of the false teachers to which we have been led, by the First Epistle of John,* is confirmed by the Second, addressed to a Christian female in those parts, named Kyria, and her children; for in this we find warnings against the same false teachers who would not acknowl-

* It is remarkable that the author of the two last Epistles of John styles himself a presbyter, a term which is not suited to designate an apostle, and particularly since at that time, and in that region, a person was living who was usually distinguished by the name of the Presbyter John. Such was the presbyter John to whom Papias appeals, Euseb. iii. 29, and we might be tempted to attribute this epistle to him. He appears to have been commonly distinguished by the name of the presbyter (which is here a title of office) John, from the apostle John, and hence the word *πρεσβύτερος* was wont to be placed before the name John. It is indeed improbable that, during the lifetime of the apostle, another could have attained such high repute among the churches, as this epistle leads us to suppose of its author; but it might have been written after the apostle's death; for that the presbyter survived him may be inferred, as Credner justly remarks, from the circumstance that Papias, in speaking of what John and each of the other apostles had said, uses the past tense, "he said," *εἶπεν*, but when speaking of the two individuals who had not heard Christ himself, Aristion and the presbyter John, his words are "they say," *λέγουσιν*. On the other hand, we are obliged to acknowledge that the great harmony of coloring, tone, and style, between the first epistle and the two others, favors the opinion of their having been written by the same person; nor can this be counterbalanced by the instances of single expressions that do not occur elsewhere in John's writings. It is difficult to imagine how that presbyter, especially if we are to consider the Apocalypse as his work, could adopt a style so foreign to himself, in so slavish a manner, during the later years of his life. As to the name of presbyter, which John here assumes, we can hardly think it of consequence that Papias distinguishes the apostles by the term presbyters, for it is evident that he so calls them only in relation to their contemporaries, as belonging to a still earlier period, and it cannot hence be inferred that John gave himself that title. But since there is no other original document extant, in which John marks his relation to the church, we cannot pronounce an opinion that he was never known by such an epithet.

edge the appearance of Jesus Christ in human nature.* He speaks of their progress as a new phenomenon, and designates them, not as the adversaries of Christianity in general, but as persons who had apostatized from the original doctrine of Christ. He warns in general against all falsifiers of that original doctrine. The faithful were not to receive them into their houses, nor to salute them as Christian brethren.†

The Third Epistle of John, which is addressed to an influential person, perhaps an overseer in one of the churches, named Gaius, also contains several important hints respecting the then existing state of the church. This Gaius had distinguished himself by the active love with which he had received the messengers of the faith, who had come from foreign parts and visited his church. But in the same Christian community there was a domineering individual, Diotrephes, who had shown himself unfriendly towards these missionaries. He not only was not ready to give them a hospitable reception, but wished to prevent others from doing so, and even threatened to exclude them from church communion. He refused to acknowledge the authority of the apostle John, and even indulged in malicious invectives against him. It is evident, that if a member of a Christian community ventured to conduct himself in such a manner towards an apostle, he must have had personal reasons for not recognising in him that dignity which was recognised by all believers as belonging to an apostle; just as those who were hostile to Paul had special grounds for disputing his apostolic authority. It is also very improbable that this unfriendly behavior towards the missionaries could have arisen at this period from an aversion to their calling, simply as such. We must rather attempt to discover a special ground of dislike to these individual missionaries. Nor is it unnatural to suppose that there was one common ground for the hostility of Diotrephes, both to the apostle and the missionaries. Now, let us suppose that the latter were of Jew-

* It appears to me most natural to explain the present in 2 John 7, *ἐρχόμενον* instead of *ἐληλυθότα*, by supposing that John used this form owing to the impression on his mind that these false teachers not only refused to acknowledge the historical manifestation of Jesus Christ, but also denied the possibility of such manifestation, and would know nothing in general of a Messiah appearing in the flesh.

† Although we may recognise in the form of this expression a natural characteristic of John, a vehemence of affection as strong in its antipathies as in its attachments, yet its harshness is much softened by a reference to the circumstances and relations amid which he was writing. He certainly wished only to express, in the strongest terms, that every appearance should be avoided of acknowledging these persons as Christian brethren. Only on this account, he says that they are not to be saluted, which, in the literal sense, he would not have said even in reference to heathens. We must restrict it to the peculiar sense of Christian salutation, which was not a mere formality, but a token of Christian brotherhood. But to preserve the purity of Christianity and the welfare of the Christian church, it was very important to exclude, from the very beginning, the reception of these persons (who, by their arbitrary speculations and fabrications, threatened to destroy the grounds of the Christian faith) into the churches, which were not sufficiently armed against their arts, and into which they had various methods of insinuating themselves.

ish descent. It is said to their praise, that they went out to publish the gospel, without taking anything of the heathen for their maintenance. If they were Jewish missionaries, this would serve as a special distinction, for from what Paul frequently says respecting this class of persons, we know that many of them abused the right of the publishers of the gospel to be maintained by those for whose salvation they labored. Now, as there existed in the Gentile churches an ultra-Pauline party, inclined to a violent, one-sided, anti-Jewish tendency, the forerunner of Marcion, so Diotrophes possibly stood at the head of such a body, and his hostile conduct towards these missionaries, as well as towards the apostle John, who on his arrival in Lesser Asia had sought, by the harmonizing influence of the Christian spirit, to reconcile the differences that were on the point of breaking out—may be traced to the same source. Thus, at a later period, Marcion attached himself to Paul alone, and paid no deference to the authority of John.

Various traditions respecting the labors of John in these regions, which he continued to a very advanced age, perfectly agree with that image of fatherly superintendence presented to us in these epistles. In a narrative attested by Clemens Alexandrinus,* we see how he visited the Christians in the parts round about Ephesus, organized the churches, and provided for the appointment of the most competent persons to fill the various church-offices. On one of these occasions, he noticed a young man who promised, under the influence of Christianity, to be of much service in the cause of the gospel. He commended him to one of the overseers of the church, as a valuable trust committed to him by the Lord. The overseer carefully watched him till he received baptism, but placed too much reliance on baptismal grace. He left him to himself, and the youth, deprived of his faithful protection, and seduced by evil associates, fell deeper into corruption, and at last became captain of a band of robbers. Some years after, when John revisited that church, he was informed to his great sorrow of the woful change that had taken place in the youth of whom he had entertained such hopes. Nothing could keep him back from hastening to the retreat of the robbers. He suffered himself to be seized and taken into their captain's presence; but he could not sustain the sight of the apostle; John's venerable appearance brought back the recollection of what he had experienced in earlier days, and awakened his conscience. He fled away in consternation; but the venerable man, full of paternal love, and exerting himself beyond his strength, ran after him. He called upon him to take courage, and announced to him the forgiveness of sins in the name of the Lord. By his fatherly guidance he succeeded in rescuing his soul, and formed him into a worthy member of a Christian community.† Another tradition pre-

* Quis dives salv. c. 42.

† Clemens gives this narrative, which breathes the spirit of John, as a veritable historical tradition and no legend, *μῦθος* — *λόγος*, not a *μῦθος* in the sense of a fable, a legend;

served by Jerome* bears also the impress of the apostle's spirit. When the venerable John could no longer walk to the meetings of the church, but was borne thither by his disciples, he always uttered the same address to the church; he reminded them of that one commandment which he had received from Christ himself as comprising all the rest, and forming the distinction of the New Covenant, "*My children, love one another.*" And when asked why he always repeated the same thing, he replied, "Because if this one thing were attained, it would be enough."

Thus the aged apostle labored to about the close of the first century; and the spirit that diffused itself from the churches of Lesser Asia during the first half of the second century, testifies of his protracted ministry in those regions. The Lord made use of his instrumentality to prevent the foundation of the faith here laid by the apostle Paul from being buried under a heap of heterogeneous speculations—and to preserve the unity of the Christian faith and life from being distracted by various extravagances; that the glorious body of the Christian church might not be divided into a multitude of sects and schools, and especially that a schism might not be produced by the increasing opposition to the Judaizing and Hellenistic elements. His peculiar tendency, which served to exhibit rather the fulness and depth of a heart filled with the spirit of Christ, than the sharpness and distinctness of doctrinal ideas, was adapted, while it rejected with ardent love whatever threatened to endanger the foundation of faith in the Son of God, to conciliate subordinate differences, and to promote the formation of a universal Christian communion out of heterogeneous elements. The extent of his influence is marked by the simple practical spirit, the spirit of zealous love to the Lord, and the spirit of Christian fidelity in firmly adhering to the original apostolic traditions, even though not perfectly understood, which distinguished the Christian teachers of Lesser Asia in their conflict with the Gnosticism which was then beginning to prevail.

With John the apostolic age of the church naturally closes. The doctrine of the gospel which by him had been still exhibited in its original purity was now exposed, without the support of apostolic authority, to a conflict with a host of opponents, some of whom had already made their appearance; the church was henceforth left to form itself to

ἀκουσον μῦθον, οὐ μῦθον, ἀλλὰ ὄντα λόγον παραδεδομένον καὶ μνήμη πεφυλαγμένον. (Hear a story, which is not a story, but a veritable account that has been handed down and carefully kept in memory.) See Segaar on the passage. Such late traditions are indeed not sufficient pledges to authenticate a narrative as true in all its parts. It is possible that such a narrative might be so constructed, partly to check the injurious confidence in the magical effects of baptism, and to set in a clear light the truth that every one after obtaining baptism needed so much the greater watchfulness over himself—and partly to counteract the opinion of the rigorists on the nature of repentance, that whoever violated the baptismal covenant by *peccata mortalia*, could not again receive forgiveness of sins. But at all events, this narrative, which is free from all coloring of the miraculous, gives altogether the impression of actual truth lying at its basis.

* Comment. in Ep. ad Galat. c. vi.

maturity without any visible human guidance, but under the invisible protection of the Lord : and finally, after a full and clear development of opposing tendencies, it was destined to attain the higher and conscious unity which distinguished the spirit of the apostle John.

We wish now to contemplate more closely the development of the Christian doctrine in its original form, and to observe how the unity of the Spirit exhibited itself in the manifoldness of the natural varieties animated by that Spirit, and in the various modes of conception which proceeded from those varieties.

BOOK VI.

THE APOSTOLIC DOCTRINE.

THE doctrine of Christ was not to be given to mankind as a rigid dead letter, in one determinate stereotyped form, but was to be announced as the word of spirit and of life; the word that should proceed from the inward life in living flexibility and variety, through men who, enlightened by the Divine Spirit, received and appropriated the doctrine in a living manner, in accordance with their various constitutional qualities, and their several peculiarities of education and life. This difference served to manifest the living unity, the riches and the depth of the Christian spirit in the manifoldness of the forms of conception, which unintentionally illustrated and supplemented each other. Thus Christianity was designed and adapted to appropriate and elevate the various tendencies of human character, to purify and unite them by means of a higher unity, and, according to the fitness of the peculiar fundamental tendencies of human nature, to operate through these for the realization of the ideal of Man, and the exhibition of the kingdom of God in the human race through all ages. We must oppose ourselves to a rigid dogmatic mode of conception, which refuses to acknowledge historical conditions in the developing process of revelation, and the process of a genetic development; but we must also protest against a false pragmatism, which would find in the historical conditions an explanation of what can only be understood as the result of the influence of Christ's spirit; which converts what is original into something derived, and the apostolic, by an analysis effected by the sheerest arbitrariness, into something post-apostolic, a method, the fundamental error of which consists in this, that for the genuine historical Christ, who is presupposed by the whole developing process of the Christian church, it substitutes an undefined phantom.

In the development of the original Christian doctrine, we can specially distinguish three peculiar fundamental tendencies, the Pauline, the Jacobean (between which the Petrine forms an intermediate link), and the Johannean.* We wish first to review the Pauline form of doctrine, since in this we find the fullest and most complete development of Christian truth, which will best serve as the basis of comparison in tracing the leading tendencies of the other apostles.

* Dr. Nitzsch, in reference to the several types of apostolic doctrine, admirably remarks—"To disown them in favor of a one-sided dogmatism, is to abandon that completeness

CHAPTER I.

THE PAULINE DOCTRINE.

IN order to develop genetically the peculiar system of this apostle, we must take into consideration the peculiar qualities of his ardent and profound mind—the peculiar education which formed him in the Pharisaic schools to a dialectic and systematic development of his doctrinal subject-matter—the peculiar manner in which he was led from the most rigorous Judaism to faith in the gospel,* by a powerful impression on his soul which formed a grand crisis in his history. We must recollect the peculiarity of his sphere of action as an apostle, in which he had to oppose an adulteration of Christianity arising from a mixture of those views which he himself had held before his conversion. In reference to the sources from which he derived his knowledge of the Christian doctrine, we must also bear in mind what he says respecting his independence and separate standing as a teacher of the gospel. There is no doubt, for he occasionally alludes to it, that he had met with a traditionary record of the sayings, actions, and precepts of Christ, and these formed the materials for the development of his Christian knowledge, (pp. 101–103); but the Spirit promised by Christ to his disciples, who was to disclose to them the whole meaning and extent of the truth announced by him, enlightened Paul in an independent manner, so as to develop the truths of which the germ was contained in those traditions, and form them into one whole with the earlier divine revelations, and with the truths implanted in the original constitution of man as a religious being. Those who blame him for blending foreign Jewish elements with Christianity, entirely misunderstand that apostle, who, above all others, most clearly perceived the opposition of the Jewish and Christian methods, and gave that opposition the fullest development. Nor does it in the least justify their censures that he made use of certain Jewish elements, which contained nothing at variance with Christianity, but on the contrary, were designed to serve as the groundwork of the new dispensation. A comparison of the Pauline leading ideas with the words of Christ as reported by Matthew and Luke, proves that the germs of the former are contained in the latter, if we do not invert the order of things and regard those words which could come from no human spirit, which bear on them the undeniable marks of inimitable originality, words of inexhaustible contents, in which the striving of a sound mind can only be for ever penetrating

and solidity which these modes of contemplating the Christian faith impart while they reciprocally complete one another; it is to slight that by which scripture truth maintains its calm elevation above all conflicting systems."—See *die theologische Zeitschrift*, edited by Schleiermacher, De Wette, and Lücke. 1822, No. 3, p. 68. * See p. 79.

deeper and deeper—if we do not regard such words as nothing more than a reflection of the tendencies that first flowed from that original spirit. But that which moved before the spiritual vision of Paul, the image of Christ in whose countenance there shone for him the glory of God, that which compelled his proud and lofty spirit, after long resistance, to do homage and bow itself in all humility, was no phantom, was not the, to him well known, reflected image of the divine race of men.

Those which constituted the preparative convictions for Paul's whole Christian life, and determined his transition from Judaism to Christianity, laid also the foundation for the peculiar form in which the latter was received and intellectually apprehended by him. Here we find the natural central point, from which we proceed in the development of his doctrine. The ideas of "law," νόμος, and "righteousness," δικαιοσύνη, form the connexion as well as the opposition of his earlier and his later views. The term δικαιοσύνη in the Old Testament sense, designates the perfect theocratic way of thinking and life, and also that unrestricted theocratic right of citizenship which entitled to a participation in the blessings of the community, and to eternal felicity. According to his former views, Paul believed that he had acquired a title to the epithet "righteous," δίκαιος, by the strict observance of the law; as, in truth, the Pharisees, to whom he belonged, placed their confidence and indulged their pride in that observance, while they guarded against the violation of the law by a variety of prohibitions. He was, as he himself asserts (Philip. iii.) blameless as far as related to this legal righteousness. And now from his Christian point of view the epithet "righteous,"* was in his esteem the highest that could be given to a human being, and "righteousness" expressed complete fitness for participation in all the privileges and blessings of the Theocracy, and consequently of salvation, of "life," ζωή. "Righteousness" and "life" were always in his mind correlative ideas. But his conceptions of the nature of this righteousness had undergone a total revolution since he was convinced of the insufficiency and nullity of that which he had before distinguished by this name. That "legal righteousness," δικαιοσύνη νομική, he now regarded as only an apparent righteousness, which might satisfy human requirements, but could not, however plausible, deceive a holy God, and therefore was of no avail in reference to the kingdom of God. It was henceforth his fundamental principle, that no man by such works as he might be able to accomplish under the guidance and aid of the law, could attain

* Paul was very far from employing the word δικαιοσύνη merely to designate a subordinate moral condition, like the later anti-Jewish Gnostics, for he always proceeded on the theocratical principles of the Old Testament. I cannot therefore admit that, in Rom. v. 7, a higher degree of morality is intended by the word "good" than by the word "righteous." The opposite is evident, from the manner in which Paul places these words together in Rom. vii. 12.

a righteousness* that would avail before God.† This idea which marks the opposition between his earlier and later views, it was his main object to develop in arguing with his Judaizing opponents.

Now he certainly in this controversy first treated of the "works of the law" as an observance of the ritual prescriptions of the law; for his adversaries wished to impose even these on the believing Gentiles as belonging to the true righteousness, and as essential to fitness for the kingdom of God; and this it was which he would not allow. Yet from the light of Judaism alone, such a distinction between the ceremonial and moral law was not possible, for everything was contemplated as a divine command; both equally involved obedience to the divine revealed will, and both required a disposition of sincere piety.‡ Though Paul in different passages and references had sometimes the ritual, and at other times the moral portion of the law especially in his thoughts, yet the same general idea lies always at the basis of his reasonings. When he had occasion, as in the Epistle to the Galatians, to impugn the justifying power and continued obligation of the ceremonial law, still his argumentation proceeds on the whole idea of the law. It is the idea of an externally prescribed rule of action, the law as commanding, but which by its commands can never produce an internal alteration in man. Satisfaction can be given to the law—which indeed is true of every law as such—only by perfect obedience. Now since no man is able to effect the obedience thus required by the divine law, it of course pronounces condemnation on all as guilty of its violation; Gal. iii. 10. This is true of the imperative moral law which is revealed in the conscience, not less than of particular injunctions of this law exhibited in the Old Testament theocratic form, as Paul himself applies it, in the Epistle to the Romans, to the law written on the hearts of men, the law of conscience, which, as he asserts, calls forth the consciousness of guilt in those to whom the law was not given in the external theocratic form.

In reference to the *whole* idea of the law as the revelation of the divine requirements to man in the form of imperative statutes, the apostle says, Gal. iii. 21, that if it could make men inwardly alive, if it could impart a true internal life from which all goodness would spontaneously proceed, then it would be right to speak of a righteousness proceeding from the law. Yet in that case, if man were truly in harmony with the requirements of the law in the constitution of his internal life, it could

* We use the word righteousness as a translation of Hebraic and Hellenic terms, in a sense answering only to the original signification of the German word gerecht, *that which is as it should be*.

† The Pauline formula, οὐ δικαιοῦται ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου or ἐκ νόμου πᾶσα σὰρξ, was most probably adopted by Paul at a very early period, having been suggested by the antithetic development of his Christian convictions, which had their origin in the mode of his conversion.

‡ When Christ, in the Sermon on the Mount, says that he came not to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfil, he certainly made no such distinction. See *Life of Christ*, p. 230.

not be properly said that he obtained a righteousness available before God by the works of the law; for the external rather supposes the internal—the disposition of true righteousness which has already become manifest of itself to the eye of Omniscience;* the internal cannot proceed from the external, but the external must proceed from the internal. Still, in this case, works corresponding to the requirements of the law, would be the necessary marks of the truly righteous and of the righteousness that avails before God, something that is truly well-pleasing to God. But in the present condition of man, this is nowhere to be found. The disposition corresponding to the requirements of the law does not exist in man, and an external law cannot produce a change internally, cannot communicate power for fulfilling its own commands, nor overcome the opposition that exists in the disposition. Even if a man be influenced by sensuous impulses, by carnal fear or hope, by vanity which would commend itself to God or man, to accomplish a formal fulfilment of what is commanded, still the disposition required by the spirit of the law would be wanting. The works resulting from such attempts, whether they relate to the moral or to the ritual part of the law, lack the disposition which is the mark of the genuine righteousness that presents itself as such before a holy God. It results from this connexion of ideas, that though “works of the law” may in themselves be works which really exhibit the fulfilling of the law, they would be considered by Paul as acts of a merely apparent, external, and not internal, obedience; they would bear the impress of mere legality in opposition to true piety and morality. The “works of the law” are not equivalent to “good works,” but opposed to them; Eph. ii. 10. Of such a legal righteousness he speaks when he says, Phil. iii. 6, that in this respect he had been a Phar-

* This is acknowledged by Aristotle; *ὅτι δεῖ τὰ δίκαια πράττοντας δικαίους γίνεσθαι*—τὰ πράγματα δίκαια λέγεται, ὅταν ἡ τοιῶντα, οἷα αὖν ὁ δίκαιος πράξειεν· δίκαιος δ' ἐστὶν οὐχ ὁ ταῦτα πράττων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ οὕτω πράττων ὡς οἱ δίκαιοι πράττουσιν, (it is necessary that those who do righteously should be righteous. Deeds are said to be righteous when they are such as the righteous man should do; and not he who does *such* things is righteous, but he who also *so* does as the righteous do.)—Eth. Nich. ii. 3. As Paul contrasts the righteousness of the law and that of true righteousness, so Aristotle contrasts the τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν νόμων τεταγμένα ποιεῖν, (the things prescribed by the laws to be done,) and the πῶς ἔχοντα πράττειν ἕκαστα, ὥστ' εἶναι ἀγαθόν, λέγω δ' ὅλον διὰ προαίρεσιν (the *φρονεῖν* τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, “the minding the things of the Spirit,” from which all right action must proceed; Rom. viii. 5.) καὶ αὐτῶν ἐνεκα τῶν πραττομένων. Τὴν μὲν προαίρεσιν ὀρθὴν ποιεῖ ἡ ἀρετή, (somehow having to do everything, just to be good; but I speak of such an one as acts from choice and for the sake of the very things *that are done*. *Virtue makes the choice right*.) But Christianity elevates the reference of the mind above the reflection of the good in the “things done,” *πραττόμενα*, to the “good itself,” *αὐτὸ ἀγαθόν*, the original source and archetype of all good in God, to communion with God, and the exhibition of this communion in the actions of the life. It is the *disposition* of the truly righteous which refers everything to the glory of God. Morality is a manifestation and exhibition of the divine life. And Christianity points out the process of development through which a man, by means of regeneration, may attain to that “virtue,” *ἀρετή*, which produces the right “choice,” *προαίρεσις*.

is seen without blame, though viewing it afterwards from the Christian point of view he esteemed it as perfectly nugatory. Thus, in a two-fold sense, Paul could say that by works of the law no man could be justified before God. Taking the expression *works of the law* in an ideal sense, no man *can* perform such works as are required by the law; taking it in an *empirical* sense, those works which are actually performed in formal obedience to the law are not such as correspond to its spirit and requirements.

If the assertion of an insufficiency of the righteousness of the law be made without more exactly defining it, it may be supposed to mean, that the moral commands of the law exhibit only an inferior moral status, and on that account can lead no one to true righteousness. According to this supposition, our judgment of the actual purpose of Christianity would take a particular direction, and we should consider the exhibition of a complete system of morals, as forming its essential preëminence over the former dispensation. But from the manner in which Paul makes this assertion, it is evident that this is not his meaning. He never complains of the law as defective in this respect, but on the contrary eulogizes it as in itself holy and good; Rom. vii. 12. The single commandment of love which stands at the head of the law, contains in fact everything (Romans xiii. 9) essential to moral perfection, and whoever fulfilled this would be truly righteous. And in the first two chapters of the Epistle to the Romans his aim is to prove that the Jews in relation to their law, as well as the Gentiles in relation to the moral law inscribed on their hearts, were not wanting in their knowledge of what was good, but in the power of will to perform what they knew to be good. The reason why the law could not produce true righteousness, consisted in the fact that it presented goodness only in the form of an external command, and also in the relation of the command to the moral condition of those to whom the law was given. This leads us to the central point of the Pauline Anthropology; namely, human nature as estranged from the divine life and standing in opposition to the requirements of the law; *whether the eternal moral law, or the law in its outward theocratical form.* This opposition we must now examine more minutely.

That principle in human nature which strives against the fulfilment of the law, the apostle generally distinguishes by the name of *the Flesh*, and the man in whom this principle predominates, or the man whose mind is not yet transformed by Christianity, by the name of "carnal," *σαρκικός*, or "minding the things of the flesh," *τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς φρονῶν*. He represents this principle striving against the law as a law in the members, which opposes the law of reason; he speaks of "the motions of sin in the members" which obstructed the fulfilment of the law acknowledged by the mind; Romans vii. 5. The body as the seat of sinful desires he calls the "body of sin," *σῶμα τῆς ἀμαρτίας*, Rom. vi. 6, the "body of the flesh," *σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς*, Col. ii. 11. Hence we might conclude, that the apostle deduced sin from the opposition between sense

and spirit in human nature, and that he considered evil as a necessary transition-point in the development of human nature, till spirit acquired the perfect ascendancy. But this could not be the apostle's meaning, for he considered this conflict between reason and sense, not as founded in the original nature of man, but as the consequence of a *free* departure from his original destination, as something for which he was guilty; and here we see of what practical importance in the Pauline doctrine is the supposition of an original perfection in man and a fall from it. Hence we must consider in every instance, the preponderance of sensuous inclination over reason, according to Paul's view, only as an essential consequence of the first moral disunion.

But there are also in general many things to be urged against the supposition that when he specifies the "flesh," σὰρξ, as the source of sin, he meant nothing but sensuousness in opposition to the spiritual principle in man. In Gal. v. 20, among the works of the "flesh," he mentions "divisions," διχοστασίαι, which can by no means all be attributed to sensuous impulses. It is possible, indeed, to argue in favor of such an interpretation by saying, that Paul had in view those divisions which he traced to sensuous impulses, to a sensuous way of thinking, to a Judaism that adhered to sensuous objects, and opposed the more spiritual conceptions of Christianity. But it appears still more surprising that he traces everything, in that erroneous tendency which he opposed in the church at Colossæ, to the flesh, to a "fleshly mind," νοῦς σαρκικός; and here it would be difficult to attribute everything to a sensuous addictedness, for we meet on the contrary with a morbid striving at freedom from the senses, an ascetic tendency which would defraud the bodily appetites of their just claims. And even if in all these attempts we detected the workings of a refined sensuality, that tendency which, while cleaving to outward objects, could not rise to the pure inward religion of the spirit; still we find that in the Corinthian church also, the apostle traced to the flesh everything which either openly or secretly opposed Christianity, not excepting even the speculative Grecian tendency, the "seeking after wisdom," σοφίαν ζητεῖν, which treated the simple gospel with contempt. From all these considerations, we may infer with certainty that something more than sensuousness was included in the Pauline idea of flesh. And it confirms this conclusion, that Paul not only uses the phrase "to walk as men," κατὰ ἄνθρωπον περιπατεῖν, as equivalent to "walking after the flesh," κατὰ σάρκα περιπατεῖν, but also employs the designation "natural man," ἄνθρωπος ψυχικός as equivalent to "carnal man," ἄνθρωπος σαρκικός, 1 Cor. ii. 14. All this relates only to the opposition of the Human to the Divine, whether the σὰρξ or the ψυχὴ against the θεῖον πνεῦμα. Paul detected in the philosophic conceit of the Greeks, which, with all its striving, could not pass beyond the bounds of earthly existence, and satisfied itself without finding the highest good which alone can give true satisfaction to the mind, and he detected in the arrogance of the imaginary legal righteousness of the Jews, the same principle of the flesh that he

found in the thirst for sensuous pleasure. There was a *wisdom after the flesh*, σοφία κατὰ σάρκα, a *righteousness after the flesh*, δικαιοσύνη κατὰ σάρκα. These ideas, "flesh," "world," "spirit of the world," σὰρξ, κόσμος, πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου, correspond to one another. Thus the term flesh denotes human nature generally, in its state of estrangement from the divine life, a tendency towards the world cut loose from the tendency towards God; and from this designation we cannot determine what Paul considered as the one fundamental tendency from which all the forms of sin might be deduced, or whether he held in general that there was any one such source. On this last point we find no precise explanation in his writings. But as he represented the *living to God*, *to Christ*, (θεῷ, Χριστῷ ζῆν,) to be the principle of good in man, it is implied that *the living to one's self*, (ἐαυτῷ ζῆν,) the self-seeking tendency (the ἐγὼ in relation to self, not subordinating itself to the religious sentiment, Gal. ii. 20), was the fundamental tendency of evil. Now, partly because the power of the sinful principle in the present condition of human nature makes itself known by the conflict of sensuous inclinations with the law acknowledged by the Spirit—partly because Christianity first spread itself among those classes in which it had to combat most of all with the power of rude sensuality—partly because the body serves as the organ of the sinful tendency which has the mastery in the soul, and the power of sinful habit continues in it, with a sort of self-subsistence, even after the soul has been made partaker of a higher life;—on all these accounts, Paul often employs the term flesh to express the whole being of sin.

Paul commonly refers only to the consciousness of sin as an universal fact in human nature, and appeals to what every man may know from his own inward experience. By this means alone could his preaching everywhere find acceptance, because it was based on a fundamental truth, which was not received from tradition, nor on the testimony of foreign authority, but manifested itself in the consciousness of every individual. The consciousness of this schism in human nature, and the feeling arising out of it of the need of redemption, remains in its unchangeable validity, independent of all historical tradition, even though man must acknowledge this schism as a given fact without being able to explain its origin. This internal fact, to which Paul appealed as a matter of immediate consciousness, we must distinguish from all modes of explaining it,* which may

* This fact, the only one necessary to be presupposed in order to faith in a Redeemer, is in itself independent of all investigations respecting the derivation of the human race; and, as something known by immediate inward experience, belongs to a province of life which lies out of the range of all speculation, or of inquiries into natural science and history. And the doctrine of a pre-existence of souls, though insufficient to explain this fact, leaves it untouched, or even requires to be explained by it. The same is also true of Müller's peculiar modification of this doctrine, viz., preëxistence in some wholly undefined, embryonic state of being. In his attempt to solve one of the most difficult of problems, to maintain moral freedom without sophistry, I must confess he has done himself great credit by his method of solution, though I am very little disposed to agree with it.—It is essential to Christianity that it rests on an historical basis of fact, which, in order to be

appear untenable, even while the fact itself, and the sense of a need of redemption springing out of it, and the faith in a Redeemer proceeding from that sense of need, retain their value undiminished. Hence it is very natural, and a proof of the apostle's wisdom, that he treats in so few passages of the original perfection of the first man, and of the first sin, compared with the number which relate to this universal fact. But it by no means follows, that what he says on this subject has a merely accidental connexion with his Christian convictions; that everything which he says of the first man, only served as a foil, borrowed from the notions in vogue among the Jews, to set the redeeming work of Christ in a more striking light by the contrast. We may rather affirm that this fact is intimately and closely connected with the whole Christian consciousness of the apostle, for it lies everywhere at the basis, where he represents this schism not as something included in the plan of the divine creation itself, and necessary in the development of human nature, but as something for which man is guilty. To justify the holiness and love of God, it must have been important for him to be able to say, that man was not created in this condition by God, but that it originated in an abuse of the freedom bestowed upon him.*

But this view of the subject is not admissible if, as many have maintained, Paul exhibited the first man only as a representative of human nature generally, and wished to show by his example how, by virtue of the original constitution of human nature, lust appeared in opposition to the rational principle or to the capability for divine knowledge—that this

acknowledged in its true meaning, only presupposes experiences which every man can make for himself.

* Krabbe, a friend specially dear to me, in his excellent work, *Die Lehre von der Sünde*, p. 56, remarks, that he does not clearly understand what are my views respecting the origination of sin in the primitive state of man. But it was foreign to my object—since I only wished to develop the doctrines of the apostle Paul in the form in which they were conceived and represented by him, and their mutual connexion—to explain myself further on this topic, and to state, as I must have done as a systematic theologian, that, according to my conviction, the origin of evil can only be understood as a fact, a fact possible by virtue of the freedom belonging to a created being, but not to be otherwise deduced or explained. It lies in the idea of evil, that it is an utterly inexplicable thing, and whoever would explain it nullifies the very idea of it. It is not the limits of our knowledge which make the origin of sin something inexplicable to us, but it follows from the essential nature of sin as an act of free will, that it must remain to all eternity an inexplicable fact. It can only be understood *empirically* by means of the moral self-consciousness. Τὸ ἐρώτημα, δὲ πάντων αἰτιὸν ἐστὶ κακῶν, μᾶλλον δὲ ἢ περὶ τούτου ὥδης, ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ ἐγγιγνομένη, ἣν εἰ μὴ τις ἐξαιρεθῇσεται, τῆς ἀληθείας ὅντως οὐ μὴ ποτε τύχοι, — (the enquiry, what is the cause of all evils, or rather the labor-pains on this subject, which are begotten in the soul, and of which if the soul be not relieved it can never attain to real truth.) Ep. ii. Platon. Whoever in his arrogant littleness can satisfy himself with mutilating human nature and reducing it to a minimum, with substituting a certain form of speculative thought in place of the whole man, may adjust, after his own fashion, all the phenomena in the moral world; but the unconquerable voice of Nature will know how to assert her rights against all such fine-spun theories.

is constantly repeated in the case of every individual, in order that man, from the consciousness of this opposition, may attain through redemption to the efficient supremacy of religious conviction in his nature. This chain of ideas we should certainly find in Paul's writings, if it could be proved that, in Rom. vii. 9, and ff., he alluded to the condition of original innocence; and wished to shew how by the commandment that state of childlike ingenuousness was removed, and the slumbering lust was brought into consciousness and raised to activity. But it cannot be proved that the apostle, where he speaks of an apparent freedom from guilt, in which the principle of sinfulness though scarcely developed lay at the bottom, had in his thoughts that original freedom from guilt which he rather describes as sinlessness. Certainly he could not have said that by one man sin came into the world, if, in Rom. vii. 9, he had assumed the existence of sin already in the first man according to his original constitution, as something grounded in the essence of human nature. In order to reconcile this, something foreign must be introduced into Paul's train of thought, which can by no means be shewn to belong to it. If we proceed on the supposition that a freedom, in the sense in which it must be allowed according to this Pauline doctrine, and a transition from sinlessness to sin, are something inconceivable, still we are not justified in explaining Paul according to a representation of which no trace can be found in his writings, not to add that such a view is opposed to his moral and religious spirit, as well as to that of Christianity in general; for according to it, the consciousness of freedom, and the sense of guilt connected with it, could be nothing else than a necessary deception imposed by the Creator himself in the development of human nature, a self-delusion unavoidable to the individual self-consciousness.

Paul, indeed, says in 1 Cor. xv. 46, that in the development of humanity, the "natural," *ψυχικόν*, must go before the "spiritual," *πνευματικόν*—that human nature as derived from the earthly man must first develop itself, and only then should the heavenly man enter into the process of development, and penetrate it with a new divine principle of life. But certainly it was not Paul's intention so to be understood, as if, in virtue of that earthly constitution of human nature, sin must form a necessary transition-point, that sinlessness might first proceed from Christ, which would stand in direct contradiction to what we have observed respecting the Pauline views. In this passage, according to the connexion, a contrast is not principally intended between the idea of one's being under subjection to sin, and being sinless; but between being subjected to death, and being raised above death. It is only affirmed here, that the first man wanted the divine life-giving spirit which first proceeded from Christ, which will allow nothing heterogeneous to remain along with it, but communicates to whatever it comes in contact with, an unchangeable divine life. It certainly follows that man must advance to the higher position of a divine life, exalted above the domain of death. But it by no means follows that sin was something placed in the original

constitution of human nature ; that sin must form a necessary transition-point for that progressive development and that exaltation of human nature which afterwards would be accomplished through redemption, and which without it could not have been prepared. We must rather consider it to be Paul's doctrine, that man was destined to raise himself to the height intended for him by a perfectly pure development not defiled by sin. Only after sin had made its appearance, as something which ought not to have come forth, did redeeming grace manifest itself in opposition to it, as free compassion towards those who had incurred the guilt of sin ; and it is the work of grace, not merely to restore what had been depraved by sin, which ought not to have come into being, but also to raise man to that higher stage for which, by his free acting, he ought to have made himself worthy. But still the restoration of the original image of God which had been marred by sin, (Col. iii. 10 ; Eph. iv. 24,) always remains a chief point in the work to be accomplished by redemption. The old man is not implanted in the original nature of the first man, but was first produced from sin striving against the original nature. The new creation is conceived as a renovation, a restoration of the original. Paul recognises in man—if in fallen man, (Acts xvii,) certainly so much more in the original man—an “offspring of God,” which was destined to develop, and to manifest itself, and to form everything out of itself, without sin which stands in contradiction to it. According to all this, sin always appears as something that ought to have remained far away from the course of human development.

Thus, then, the sin of the first man has so great significance in Paul's connexion of ideas, because it was the free act from which a course of life proceeded, in contradiction to the original moral nature of man, or to the image of God in that nature. When he says, Rom. v. 12, “By one man sin entered into the world,” we shall most naturally understand it (as he adds no other limiting clause) as follows: that the sinful tendency of the will, or the opposition between the human and the divine will, now first made its appearance in the hitherto sinless human nature, and propagated itself with the development of the race from this first point. This is according to a law which regulates the propagation of mankind as a whole, and in the special divisions of nations and families, without which there could be no history, no development of man as a race ; but the whole would be broken up into separate moments wholly severed from each other—an altogether atomic or nominalistic view which is refuted by an unprejudiced examination of history and of life. And in fact, we see Paul applying the same law, when he contemplates evil in its combined and reciprocal effects in the great mass of mankind, the collective body of Jews or Greeks.

All men from that time onward have sinned, since they have followed the sinful tendency that has passed upon them through the development of the race. In this sense, Paul says that by the disobedience of one all

became sinners.* He also connects sin and death together, and affirms that with sin death came into the world, and had propagated itself among all men. Now, according to Paul's views, this cannot be understood of an essential change in the physical organization of man, as if the body by that event first became mortal from being immortal, for he expressly asserts the opposite in 1 Cor. xv. 46, 47, since he attributes to the first man "an earthy body," *σῶμα χοϊκὸν*, "a natural," *ψυχικὸν*, in contrast with the "spiritual body," *σῶμα πνευματικὸν*, of the resurrection.

This change, therefore, can only relate, partly to the mode and manner in which the individual earthly existence now terminates, the forcible disruption of the connexion between soul and body which we designate by the name of death, partly to the manner in which the necessity of such a death would appear to the human mind. But both are closely connected with one another. As life, life in communion with God, a divine, holy, happy, and imperishable life, are ideas indissolubly connected in the New Testament phraseology, particularly in the writings of Paul and John, so, on the other hand, are equally connected the ideas of sin, unhappiness, and death. As man in communion with God becomes conscious of a divine life raised above all death eternal, and the thought of the interruption of life or of annihilation is unknown to him; so when by sin this connexion is broken, and, in estrangement from God as the eternal fountain of life, he becomes conscious of existence limited to itself, the thought of death first springs up. Without this consciousness

* It is now, indeed, generally acknowledged, that in the last clause of Rom. v. 12, the relative pronoun cannot be referred to Adam. It is also not evident to me (as Rothe, p. 32 of his acute essay on this passage, Wittenberg, 1836, has maintained), that *ἐφ' ᾧ* cannot be translated "*for that*;" the original meaning of this preposition with the dative, by means of which it expresses something conditional, an accompaniment, the point of connexion for something, easily passes into the sign of a certain causal relation; and as *ἐπεὶ* with a dative signifies this causal relation, *ἐφ' ᾧ* by an attraction may therefore signify "*for that*," "*because that*." This meaning is certainly to be adopted in 2 Cor. v. 4. What Rothe, p. 25, has said against this construction in the last passage is quite untenable. Nor does Philip. i. 21-24, contradict this interpretation, for anxiety after eternal life by no means excludes the repugnance necessarily founded in human nature against the conflict with death. Man would always prefer passing to a higher state of existence without so violent a process of transition, and the "being burdened" is certainly (what Rothe denies) quite as necessary and constant a mark of the Christian life as the "earnestly desiring." I will readily allow that Paul has made use of this expression in the Romans to designate causality, since it corresponds more than any other to the form under which he is here thinking of causality. The first original causality is the sin of Adam—the secondary cause, the connecting link for this continuation of death from Adam is the sinning of individuals, by which the connexion between sin and death, subjectively considered, is conditioned. Death as punishment of the first sin which was committed with a clear consciousness of its being a transgression of a positive law, spread itself, together with the sinful tendency, upon all the posterity of Adam, and Paul finds its point of connexion with all in this, that all have sinned. The connexion between sin and death is universal, running through the whole history of the human race, because all men have participated in sin. It is therefore a wholly different matter when a sinless being enters into the development of the race; with such an one the natural connexion between sin and death could find no place.

of estrangement and death, the transition from an earthly existence to a higher—objective in itself, and subjective to the mind*—would have been only the form of a higher development of life, a transfiguration according to nature, and no violent revolution. There could not have existed that struggle in the nature of man, of which Paul speaks in 2 Cor. v. 4. Thus Paul calls sin the sting of death, 1 Cor. xv. 56, by which he marks the internal connexion between the consciousness of death and the consciousness of guilt; as the wounding power of death is founded in sin, death as death, as that terrific object to the mind of man, exhibits itself only in connexion with the consciousness of sin.

Paul certainly represents a corruption of human nature as the consequence of the first sin, and assumes a supremacy of the sinful principle in the human race, but not in such a manner that the original nature of man as the offspring of God, and created in his image, has been thereby destroyed. Rather he supposes the existence in man of two opposing principles—the predominating sinful principle, and the divine principle more or less depressed and obscured yet manifesting its light. Hence he deduces an undeniable consciousness of God, and an equally undeniable moral self-consciousness as a radiation from the former. And as he recognises an original and universal revelation of God to the human consciousness, so also he acknowledges in human nature a designed aptitude to receive it; as there is a self-testimony of God, in whom the spirit of man lives, moves, and exists, so also there is an original susceptibility in human nature corresponding to that testimony. The whole creation as a revelation of God, especially of his almightiness and goodness,† is designed to arouse the spirit

* Krabbe, in his work already quoted, although the premises deduced by him from 1 Cor. xv. 45 ought to have led to the same view as mine, has yet opposed it (p. 191) under the supposition that I have not admitted an objective alteration of the form of death, but only a subjective alteration in reference to the form in which it is represented to the mind of man. To guard against this misunderstanding, I have added several new observations to render my meaning more explicit.

† In Rom. i. 20, Paul first asserts in general, that the invisible being of God is manifested to the thinking spirit by the creation; he then specifies the revelation of his power, and adds to it the general term "Godhead," *θειότης*, (on the form of this word see Rückert,) including everything else which belongs to the revelation of the idea of God, to our conceptions of the divine attributes, to the "invisible things of God," *ἀόρατα τοῦ θεοῦ*. We cannot deduce from the words (for it was not the apostle's intention to be more definite) a special reference to any other divine attribute; but it is not without reason that he brings forward the idea of Almightiness, because this first manifests itself in the religious consciousness developed by the contemplation of nature, and hence the consciousness of dependence on a higher power is the predominant sentiment in natural religion. Still we may infer, from the term "were thankful," *ἐυχαρίστησαν*, in v. 21, that the goodness of God was present to his thoughts, which is favored by Acts. xiv. 17. In this result I agree with Schneckenburger in his Essay on the Natural Theology of Paul and its sources, contained in his *Beiträge zur Einleitung in's N. T.* But I cannot perceive the necessity for deducing the manner in which Paul has expressed himself, from any other source than from the depths of his own spirit, enlightened by the Spirit of Christ; and in Philo's far less original investigations, I can find nothing which can serve to explain Paul's thoughts and language, although I see nothing in the use Schneckenburger is disposed to make of Philo

of man to a perception of this inward revelation of God. But since by the predominant sinful tendency of man the susceptibility for this revelation of God is impaired, he has lost the ability to raise himself, by means of the feelings awakened by outward impressions, to a development of the idea of God, to serve as an organ for which is the highest destiny of the human spirit.* Since the consciousness in man of an interior being, by virtue of which he is distinct from nature, and, exalted above it, is capable of appropriating the supernatural, has been depressed by sin,—since he has enslaved himself to that nature over which he was destined to rule,† he is no longer able to develop the feelings excited in his breast, of dependence on a higher power, and of gratitude for the blessings bestowed upon him, so as to believe in an Almighty God as Creator and Governor of the world, but he allows these feelings to terminate in the created beings, in the powers and phenomena of nature by which they were first excited. Thus originated, as Paul describes in the Epistle to the Romans, idolatry, the deification of nature, which yet implies a depressed consciousness of God, and to this, as lying at its basis, Paul appealed in his discourse at Athens. This depression of the consciousness of God by the predominating consciousness of the world or the sensuous consciousness of self, tended more and more to the deterioration of man's moral nature; Rom. i. 28. Yet this moral nature, as it belonged to the essence of humanity, could not be entirely obliterated. It manifested itself in the conscience as the undeniable emanation from the consciousness of God. According to Paul, this is the revelation of an internal law for the life, and of a judgment upon it, undeniable by man, even should he not deduce from it the consciousness of that God who here manifests himself as a hidden legislative and judging power. Men, in passing judgment on one another, give evidence of the power of that innate law of their nature, and condemn themselves; Rom. ii. 1.‡

for the illustration of the New Testament, which tends to depreciate the latter; and I must entirely agree with his excellent remarks on the relation of the Alexandrian-Jewish school to the appearance of Christianity. He also justly remarks, that those who in their folly think that they can illustrate the greatest revolution in the human race (the moral creation effected by Christianity) by excerpts from Philo (an attempt as rational as to explain the living principle by a corpse), must serve quite a different object from that which they have proposed to themselves.

* The connexion of the inward and outward revelation of God was probably in the mind of Paul when he used the phrase "in them," *ἐν αὐτοῖς*. Romans i. 19.

† The dominion of man over nature presupposes in its true significance the free development of the knowledge of God, on which the elevation of the spirit over nature and its affinity to God are founded, as a means of exercising that true dominion.

‡ I cannot agree with those who think that Paul, in this passage, has the Jews specially in mind, who are mentioned in v. 9. Had this been the case, the transition from those of whom he had been speaking, the Gentiles, to this new subject, the Jews, must have been in some way marked. But the "therefore," *διό*, only refers us to what immediately precedes, i. 32, which relates to the Gentiles, though it does not follow that Paul confined himself to the same class of Gentiles. "Since whoever knows the law of God, (according to which they who do such things are worthy of death), and yet does what it

We must here take notice of Paul's trichotomy of human nature. We find, indeed, only one passage where it is expressly mentioned, (1 Thess. v. 23,) but there are several others in which it is indicated. Though among the Greeks the term *ψυχὴ* was employed to denote the animal principle of life in distinction from the *νοῦς*, as the *νοῦς* corresponds to the *λογικόν*, (the rational principle,) yet we cannot suppose such a mode of conception in Paul, as is evident from a comparison of all which can be found in his writings referable to this subject. The "natural man," *ψυχικὸς*, the man in whom the *ψυχὴ* alone predominates, who is in a state corresponding to this, cannot receive and understand the things revealed by the Spirit of God. All these things must appear to him as foolishness, for he wants the sense, the organ, by which to appropriate them; 1 Cor. ii. 14. The "spiritual man," *πνευματικὸς*, on the other hand, is the man in whom such an organ, such a sense is developed; with a sense allied to the divine he is able to receive divine things. Certainly we are not to suppose that the "spiritual man" is to be thought of as one in whom the ruling principle is the "spirit" (*πνεῦμα*) of human nature, that which is opposed to the "life," *ψυχὴ*. Without doubt we must rather suppose the reference to be to the "Divine Spirit," *πνεῦμα θεῖον*, as that which quickens the man. But yet we may conceive of the *πνευματικὸς* in Paul's sense, as the person in whom what in human nature is the *πνεῦμα* finds its natural development. We shall have to consider it as that organ corresponding to the divine *πνεῦμα*, which is destined and adapted to receive its influences and spread them through the whole of human nature. If in 1 Cor. xiv. 14, by *πνεῦμα* is to be understood the power indwelling in human nature, not merely something communicated to man, the "spiritual gift" (*χάρισμα πνευματικόν*) as something personified,* we can make good use of this application of the word. In the moments of the highest elevation or inspiration, when the discursive power is in abeyance, the "spirit" is supreme. This, as the receptive organ for the inspiration of the divine "spirit," *πνεῦμα*, is then alone developed. Thus, under the term *πνεῦμα* we shall comprise what is innermost, and deepest, and highest in man, the side of the spirit turned towards the eternal and divine—the power to become conscious of God and of divine things—the capacity for a knowledge of God, and the higher self-consciousness grounded in that; while by the term *ψυχὴ* we

forbids, cannot excuse himself,—thou canst allege no excuse for thyself; thou, whoever thou mayest be, thou who testifiest of thy knowledge of God, when thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself."

* The first interpretation here suggested, is favored by the antithesis between *πνεῦμα* and *νοῦς μου*, and the word *νοῦς*, which elsewhere corresponds to *πνεῦμα*, as the designation of the highest power in human nature, need not perplex us; for there would naturally have been made prominent here just this idea of *νοῦς* as the *νοοῦν*, the thinking faculty in man, since the immediateness of inspiration is distinguished from the mediate exercise of thought. A Greek would certainly have chosen another word than *νοῦς*, and would have distinguished between *νοοῦν* and *διανοοῦν*.

understand all that belongs to the knowledge of the world and the lower self-consciousness. In man's original state the "spirit," *πνεῦμα*, as the organ of the Divine Spirit was in communion with it as its natural, undisturbed life, and the "life," *ψυχὴ*, was the natural organ of the human *πνεῦμα*; the divine and the human were in harmonic unison. But after this connexion had been broken by sin, the *πνεῦμα*, by the predominance of the *ψυχὴ*, separated from connexion with its great fountain-head and altogether kept under, was prevented from acting and manifesting itself. Thus was formed the "natural man," *ψυχικὸς*, who with all his cultivation wants the sense for the divine, whose intellectual egoism, not less than the sensual rudeness of the man who in a narrower sense is called "carnal," *σαρκικὸς*, stands in contradiction to the divine things which the Spirit of God reveals—both are only two distinct forms of worldly-mindedness. The "natural man" furthermore remains fettered with his consciousness to the world, confined within its limits; he has no sense for the supersensuous and denies its reality; it finds no point of connexion in his merely psychical being, in which the pneumatic is altogether suppressed.

In special relation to what Paul calls the *πνεῦμα*, stands that which he designates "the inner man." The contrariety between the inner and outer man by no means corresponds to the contrariety between the body and soul, spirit or reason and sensuousness. We have seen, that according to Paul's doctrine, evil may have its seat in the intellect. There is such a thing as a reason estranged from God and ruled by egoism. But Paul never speaks of an evil residing in the inner man: the idea of the inner man only appears in reference to the Divine.

When the higher God-related nature of man begins to make itself free from the power of the ungodly principle,—to attain a consciousness of its own peculiar being, and to be sensible of its bondage—then the inner man, hitherto oppressed by the burden of worldliness, rises up. This inner man recognises in the divine law what corresponds to his own nature, and rejoices in it. But he is not yet strong enough to overcome the power of sin predominant in the outer man, and thus to bring the law into actual practice; Rom. vii. 22. He attains to new power through the divine life communicated by Christ, when Christ dwells in the heart; Eph. iii. 16, 17. The sufferings by which the outer man perishes, only serve to free and to renew the inner man more and more; 2 Cor. iv. 16. This opposition between the inner and the outward man is to be understood as involving the thought that everything which belongs to the world is external to the inner man. Evil has its ground in this, that man turns away from what is innermost to him, from his relation to God, and surrenders himself to the world over which he should be exalted by virtue of the life in God, and in consequence, man becomes continually absorbed into the world, secularized and alienated from God. Earthly envelopments oppress the true inward essence of the spirit, and keep the inner man in a state of insensibility. In proportion as man retires into the depths of

his inward being, from the dissipations of worldly things, the greater is his inward strength ; the more he turns within, the more the power of the inner man whose life is in God gains the ascendancy.

Thus Paul represents two general principles in the natural man as striving against each other ; the principle peculiar to the offspring of God, that which is allied to God in the implanted consciousness of God, and in the moral self-consciousness grounded therein, the reaction of the original religious and moral nature of man ; and the principle of sin ; or, in other words, spirit and flesh, the inner and the outer man. And as the former, the original nature of man, is checked in its development and efficiency by the latter, and detained a prisoner as by a hostile force, he describes the state of the natural man in general as one of *bondage*.* Still a distinction is to be made between the different states of this bondage, according as it is conscious or unconscious ; according as the suppressed higher nature has not yet at all become conscious of its own existence, and of the restraint imposed upon it, or according as the sense of bondage, in which man's higher self, the inner man, is held, has been awakened in the developed higher self-consciousness, and so a longing after freedom has been created. The latter is the state to which the apostle has affixed the name of bondage in the more restricted sense of the word, the bondage under the law, inasmuch as with the consciousness of the suppressed higher nature there exists at the same time a consciousness of the law revealing itself in it, that is, as far as the first consciousness is called into being by the latter. Hence these two states of unconscious or conscious bondage are distinguished, as living without the law, or living under the law. These two states the apostle describes in the 7th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans ; he there depicts, in his own person, and from his own experience, two universally existing states.

The first state he represents as one in which a man lives in delusive satisfaction, unconscious both of the requirements of the holy law and of the power of the counteracting principle of sinfulness. He awakes from this state of security, when the consciousness of the law and its requirements is excited. The moral ideal, which is presented by the law to the self-consciousness of man, exerts an attractive influence on his higher nature. He feels that he can find satisfaction and happiness only in the agreement of his life with this law. But then he sees that he has been wofully deceived, for the law when it brings forth into consciousness the sinful desires that had hitherto been slumbering in his breast, irritates them to greater activity by the opposition of its commands. The man who is enduring this conflict, is represented by Paul as saying, "The commandment that should have tended to life brought only death ; for sin which now took occasion to break forth, deceived me by the commandment and by it slew me."—Rom. vii. 10, 11. The deception which was practised by the power of the hitherto slumbering but now rampant

* The "bondage of sin," δουλεία τῆς ἁμαρτίας.

sinful desires, consisted in this, that when the law in its glory, the moral archetype, first revealed itself to the related higher nature of man, he was filled with earnest desire to seize the revealed ideal ; but this desire only made him more painfully sensible of the chasm which separated him from the object after which he aspired. Thus, what appeared at first a blissful ideal, becomes, on the contrary, death-producing, through the guilt of sin. The higher nature of man aspiring after a freer self-consciousness, is sensible of the harmony between itself and the divine law in which it delights ; but there is another power, the power of the sinful principle striving against the higher nature, which, when a man is disposed to follow the inward divine leading, drags him away, so that he cannot accomplish the good by which alone his heavenly nature is attracted. We cannot regard this disunion as one in which man, in conflict with his better knowledge and his delight in goodness, is carried away by his own passions and lusts to surrender himself to vice. If it were so, Paul, who was blameless in legal righteousness, and had been brought up in strict legal discipline, could not have spoken as he did, from his own experience. But for man from this point of view, it is not enough for him to be free from flagrant vices. Higher requirements of purity in heart and life are brought home to his consciousness, and in accordance with these he forms holy resolutions which he is unable to fulfil. How often, for example, might Paul have been overcome by the force of his choleric temperament.

In the consciousness of this wretched disunion he exclaims, "Who shall deliver me from this power of sin?"* After thus vividly calling to mind the state of disunion and unhappiness from which Christianity has set him free, he is carried away by emotions of thankfulness for redemption from that internal wretchedness ; and dropping the character he had for the moment assumed, he interrupts himself (Rom vii. 25) by an exclamation occasioned by the consciousness of his present state, and then, in conclusion, briefly adverts to the state of disunion before described. "I myself therefore, this *one* man, with the spirit serve the law of God, but with the flesh, the law of sin." If we understand the phrase, "*serve the law of God*," in the full strictness of the idea, more seems to be expressed by it than the moral state of the natural man allows : for taking the words in their highest sense, they describe such a reference of the whole life to God, such an animating of it by a practical sense of God, as must proceed from regeneration, and supposes its existence. But we must first of all accurately fix the meaning of "serve" and of "law" in this passage. Both terms are used by Paul in a two-fold manner. The fundamental idea of "serving," *δουλεύειν*, is that of a life corresponding to God's law and to the consciousness of dependence on him. But this consciousness of dependence may be of two sorts ; either, one in which the man consents with freedom, or one with which his direction of will

* Paul terms it the "body of death," inasmuch as the power of evil desires manifests itself particularly in the body as the slave of sinful habits.

stands in contradiction. And so likewise in the application of the term law, of which the general idea is a rule of life and action. This rule may be either, according to the first meaning of the word "serve," a rule proceeding from within, founded on the internal development of the life, with which the predominant tendency of the will is in perfect harmony; or it may be a rule presenting itself to the spirit of man from without, an outwardly *commanding, constraining* law, which contradicts the predominant internal tendency of the will, and whose supremacy is therefore only acknowledged by compulsion according to the second meaning of the word. Now the apostle here employs the word "serve" in the second sense, and describes a state in which the consciousness of God makes its power felt in opposition to the sinful tendency of the will, that controls the life; for if the other sense of the term were intended, that unhappy disunion would immediately cease. If the consciousness of God had become an internal law of the life with which the determinations of the will were in harmony, the "flesh" would no longer exercise its power as a determining principle of the life.

No doubt the apostle took the materials of this description from his own experience, which put it in his power to delineate the condition in such lively colors. Though educated by pious parents in Judaism, still there was for him, during childhood, a period of ingenuous simplicity, in which the consciousness of the law and of the contrariety between its requirements and the indwelling principle of sin, could not be developed with the same clearness as in maturer life. And from this first epoch of childhood, he was led on by his Pharisaic education to the summit of servitude to the law. But he represents in his own person the two universal stages of human development, by which the race, as well as individuals, should thenceforward be trained for the appropriation of redemption. He here describes in an individual example how Judaism, as the legal religion, in respect to that which constitutes its peculiar essence and by which it forms the contrast with Christianity, should serve in the progress of human development. Very different was that part of Judaism which constituted the point of union between it and the gospel, and the aspect under which it might be viewed as the gospel veiled the prophetic element, by which it was connected with the promises made before the giving of the law, and formed a continuation of them till the Redeemer himself appeared. As in order to prepare for the reception of the Redeemer, it was needful, on the one hand, to excite a consciousness of internal disunion and bondage, and the consequent sense of a need of redemption; and on the other hand, to point out the relief about to be afforded for this misery, and the personage by whom it would be effected; so Judaism was in both these respects a divine revelation and a religious economy preparatory to Christianity.

In confutation of the Jews and Judaizers, who would not recognise in Judaism a merely preparative dispensation, but maintained its perpetual validity, the apostle proved that all the leadings of the divine gov-

ernment, from the beginning of the world, related to the fulfilment of a purpose embracing the salvation of the whole fallen race of man, a purpose to communicate among all men, by the Messiah, redeeming grace, for the obtaining of which no other means would be requisite than surrendering themselves to it and receiving it by means of faith. There was, therefore, only one fundamental relation between God and man; on the part of God, a revelation of his grace in its promise and fulfilment; on the part of man, an appropriation of this grace by faith. The legal Judaism could make no alteration in this unchangeable or fundamental relation between God and man, which had been already established by the promises given to Abraham; it could not add a new condition, such as the observance of the law, for the fulfilment of the promises, Gal. iii. 15, in which case the fulfilment of the promise would be attached to something that could not be performed, since no man is capable of observing the law. There are two relations which exclude one another, the one having respect to what comes on condition of fulfilling the law, and the other to what is bestowed according to a divine promise: the former refers to something to be given as a reward of merit, the latter to a free exhibition of grace, which stipulates no other condition than a reception of what is bestowed through grace. Gal. iii. 18.

The law, therefore, formed only a preparatory, intervening economy for the Jewish nation,* partly designed to check in some measure the grosser indulgences of sin,† but more especially to call forth and main-

* To this Rom. v. 20 refers, "the law entered," νόμος παρεισηλθεν.

† Τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν, "on account of transgressions." Gal. iii. 19. The interpretation of this passage which I have followed requires to be supported against the objections of Usteri in his *Entwicklung des paulinischen Lehrbegriffs* (Development of the Pauline Doctrines), 4th ed. pp. 66, 67, and in his excellent Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, p. 114. The reasons alleged by him are, that the idea of transgression presupposes the idea of law—that according to the Pauline association of ideas, sin was called forth by the law, the law could present no check to sin, but, on the contrary, must tend to hasten the outbreak of sinfulness. Paul would therefore contradict himself, if he said that the law was added in order to check sin. But although Paul by describing "sin," ἁμαρτία, as "transgression," παράβασις, conceived of it as a transgression of the law, intending specially the positive law, yet sin, without reference to the Mosaic law, might be so denominated in reference to the law of God revealed in the conscience, and which is thereby transgressed; and Paul could by anticipation have called sins παραβάσεις, in relation to the Mosaic law which should cause single sins to appear in the form of "transgressions." According to Paul, the positive law, as well as the indwelling law of the heart, supposes an existing sinfulness in man. When the internal law as a revelation of God is outwardly presented in a definite literal form, it only serves to bring this opposition into clearer consciousness, and to counterwork the manifold influences by which this consciousness is obscured and depressed. Indeed, the law, according to Paul, cannot conquer sin internally, but only serves to manifest it in its full extent. It can produce no true holiness in the disposition; nevertheless, we can readily conceive how a positive law, bringing into clearer consciousness the opposition of good and evil, opposing to sinful inclinations the distinctly expressed divine will, by threatening and alarming would check the outward indulgence of sinful desires, act as a check on grosser immorality, and promote outward moral decorum. This, it is true, can be attained only in a very imperfect degree by the law, since

tain a vivid consciousness of sin.* While thus the law put an outward check on the sinful rudeness which was ever anew rising against it; while by this means the consciousness of the power of the sinful principle became more vivid, and hence the sense of need both of the forgiveness of sin and of freedom from its bondage was awakened, the law became a "schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ," *παιδαγωγὸς εἰς Χριστόν*. The bondage of Judaism consisted in the binding of religion to a multitude of sensible forms, which could only typify the divine that was not yet distinctly apprehended, the dependence of the development of the in-

it has not the power of operating on the internal ground, from which all the outward manifestations of sin proceed. On the one hand, the law checks the grosser outbreaks of sin; on the other, it occasions that the sinfulness called forth by opposition from its concealment, is displayed in the form of particular transgression of the law, and a man thereby becomes conscious of the hidden and deeply-seated root of all evil. Both may be represented as the work of the law; the check put on the outbreaks of sinfulness, and the greater prominence given to it in the form of particular transgressions of special commands. Both may be considered as the objects of that divine wisdom which gave the law to man, if we only keep the various references distinct from each other. On the one hand, to prevent the total brutalization of human nature, and, on the other, not to permit the self-deception that any other means of training can avail, short of that method which will effect a radical cure. As to the first point, Paul marks it in Gal. iii. 23, where he says that men were kept as prisoners by the law, which agrees with what Christ says when, in the Sermon on the Mount, he opposes the holiness of disposition attained through the gospel, to the theocratic political law, which would only restrain the outbreking force of evil in its external actions, and with what he says in Matt. xix. 8, on the relation of the law to the "hardness of heart," *σκληροκαρδία*, of men. With respect to the other interpretation of the passage—"the law is added in order to make sin knowable as such, to bring men to a clear consciousness of it"—the words do not so plainly convey this meaning. According to that interpretation they would mean: the law was given to favor transgressions, in order that transgressions might take place; the thought would, after all, be very obscurely expressed, and if this were said without further limitation, it would convey such a mean estimate of the law as Paul, from his stand-point, certainly could not allow. And as Rückert justly remarks, the use of the article with the word *παραβάσεων* (on account of certain existing sins, in order to put a check to them), better suits the method of interpretation we have followed and the connexion of the passage, since it is the design of Paul to acknowledge the importance of the law in its own though subordinate value. See in Rheinwald's *Repertorium*, No. vi., &c., Schneckenburger's review of Usteri's work on the Pauline doctrines, which agrees, in this and several other points, with our own views.

* Rom. v. 20, *ἵνα πλεονάσῃ ἡ ἁμαρτία*, "so that sin might abound," that is, that the power of indwelling sin, the intensive force of the sinful principle as such, might be manifested so much more strongly. In reference to the development of the Pauline sentiment, Fritsche, in his excellent Commentary, to which I am much indebted, justly remarks (p. 350), that this cannot be the literal sense of the passage, for here *ἁμαρτία* is spoken of as a single violation of God's law. The sense of the passage is: in order that transgressions may increase. But this must serve to make them more conscious of the intensive power of the evil principle, by its coming forth more distinctly in outward manifestation, as we detect in the symptoms of a positive disease the morbid matter which has been for a long time lurking in the system. Thus, Rom. vii. 13, in order that sin might show itself abundantly as sin, sin in its destructive power; so that the law in bringing salvation must, on account of sin, itself bring destruction.

ternal religious life on the outward and the sensuous,* which might also contribute, like the ethical part of the law, partly to restrain sensual grossness, partly to awaken the internal religious sentiment, partly to arouse it to a consciousness of the bondage that oppressed it, and to a feeling of need of freedom.† In this aspect, the unity of the moral and the ritual in the Mosaic law is apparent; both belonged to the one object of religious moral development, and subserved the same end.

The race before the introduction of Christianity, may be regarded as consisting of two general divisions, of Jews and Gentiles. The distinction between them may be seen in the contrast they furnish between natural development and Revelation. Among the Jews, God had from the beginning communicated and propagated the knowledge of himself by a connected series of revelations; by a positive law had manifested the need of redemption and given promises with ever-increasing clearness of Him who was to satisfy this need; Rom. ix. 4. The Theocracy was here presented in the form of a particular nationality, until, at last, the Redeemer arose from the midst of this nation, and connected himself in his own person with the promises made to them. The Gentiles, on the contrary, were left to themselves, and shut out from the organized historical preparation of the kingdom of God. Still the apostle recognises, as we have here remarked, an original revelation of God among the heathen, without which even idolatry could not have arisen. We must here distinguish between the two ideas of Revelation above unfolded—the general and the special.‡ The one, is the general revelation of God in the creation, and, through creation, in the reason and conscience, in which three factors are combined—the self-revelation of God in creation acting from without—the adaptation to the knowledge of God in the spirit of man, (reason and conscience)—and the undeniable connexion of created spirits with the original Spirit whose offspring they are, in whom they live and move and have their being, the fountain from which proceed all the movements of the higher life; the other, is Revelation in a more restricted sense, which does not proceed from an operation of the Divine Spirit through the medium of creation, like the former, but a Revelation by means of which man apprehends in a divine light the truths relating to salvation, the knowledge of which he could not attain by his own reason.

But to understand that general revelation of God, a mind susceptible of the Divine was required. The original consciousness of truth, in reference to religion and morals, was kept under by the predominance of the principle of sin.§ As in the life of the individual, so in the life of the race,

* The *δεδουλωσθαι ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα* — τὰ σαρκικά. See above, p. 297, *note*.

† Thus Peter calls the law in its whole extent, contrasted with the grace of redemption, "a yoke which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear." Acts xv. 10.

‡ See page 99.

§ Rom. i. 18, *τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατέχοντες*. "They repressed the truth that manifested itself to them, the consciousness of truth that was springing up in their minds

a connexion exists between the earlier and the later critical periods, by virtue of which the latter is conditioned by the former. Thus, by the continual working of sin and deification of nature from generation to generation, that original consciousness of God becomes increasingly obscured. This it is, this criminal want of freedom, which Paul means by being given up to sin and delusion. The Mosaic law corresponds, indeed, to the law written on the heart, by virtue of which death may be acknowledged to be the desert of sin; Rom. i. 32. But since this consciousness is so much obscured by the dominion of sin, Paul makes a marked distinction between the position of the theocratic people to whom the law was revealed as given by God, among whom the commanding, judging, and condemning voice of God in the law denounced all evil, and their position before and apart from that law. Thus Paul, in Rom. v. 13, 14, affirms that the objective connexion between sin and death was the same from the beginning, but that this objective connexion must, through the positive law, be made subjective by entering clearly into the human consciousness. What on the stand-point of nature left to itself, is only something lying at the basis of the consciousness, is thus brought out into vivid consciousness. The principle expressed in its absoluteness in Rom. v. 13, "*Sin is not imputed when there is no law,*" becomes relative in its application. The divine imputation of sin is regulated by the given degree of the knowledge of the law. Thus Paul, in Acts xvii. 30, which words we must regard as perfectly corresponding to the apostle's general style of thought, could speak of the times of ignorance among the heathen as an object of the divine forbearance, which is to be taken in connexion with what he says in Rom. iii. 25* respecting the non-punishment of sins that had been committed at a time when the Divine long-suffering prevailed. This is of importance in its application to the various circumstances of nations who have not yet reached a state of moral development. But although Paul distinguishes from each other the positive Divine law, and the inner moral law of nature, yet he always bears in mind the connexion between the two, and the Mosaic law appears to him as the representative of the eternal theocratic law, *the law* which God has stamped on the inner man, as appears from the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. Hence we must maintain, against those who imagine that where Paul speaks of the law, he only refers to the Mosaic law in a narrower sense, that where he represents it as condemning man and revealing to him his guilt, it appears to him, at the same time, as the representative of the Divine law, manifesting itself, although less clearly, in all mankind, and applicable to all. When also Paul, in Gal. iii. 13, speaks of the curse of the law; and in

—through sin." In these words, Paul particularly referred to the Gentiles, though they might also be applied to the Jews. It was not needful for him to point out to the Jews, that they could not allege as an excuse for their conduct the want of a knowledge of God and of his law, since they were only too much disposed to pride themselves on the mere knowledge of what had been revealed to them.

* See for the exact exposition of this passage p. 415.

Col. ii. 14, describes the same as a bond (*handwriting*), it is evident from the unmistakeable contrast in the first passage that he thinks first of the Jews, who were conscious of the obligatoriness of the law, while yet this law, in his apprehension of its idea, certainly refers to the whole human race. As long as the law retained its validity, it denounced a curse on *all* who did not observe it; while the observance of it was the only means for participating in the kingdom of God, and for attaining everlasting life. Hence, the curse it denounces must first be removed, in order that the Abrahamic blessing referring to all mankind, might be fulfilled to the Gentiles. Gal. iii. 14. Hence also, the revelation of the "wrath of God," *ὀργή θεοῦ*, among the heathen, to accomplish which is the work of the law, Rom. iv. 15, must precede, and they must be convinced that only through Christ they can be freed from this wrath, if they would be made partakers of redemption. From that law of the conscience could also proceed the sense of disunion in the inner man, and the feeling of the need of redemption, without which Christianity can find no point of connexion with, and entrance into, the heart, and this point of connexion Paul everywhere assumes in reference to the heathen.

Indeed, he makes in all respects a universal contrast between the Jews incorporated in the Theocracy, and the heathen who were living without God; though he unquestionably does not put all who were living in heathenism on the same level. Certainly he could not say of every individual, what he says of the corrupt mass in general, Eph. iv. 19, that they had given themselves up to the indulgence of their lusts with a suppression of all moral feeling; he no doubt recognised in the civil and domestic virtues of the heathen some scattered rays of the repressed knowledge of God. In this respect he says, Rom. ii. 14-26, comparing the heathen with the Jews, that where the former fulfilled in some cases the commands of the law, following the law written on their hearts, they thereby passed sentence of condemnation on the Jews, to whom the positive law had been given, of which they boasted, but neglected to obey it. Not that we can suppose him to mean, that in any instance there was anything like a perfect fulfilment of the law. To suppose this, would be in direct contradiction to what Paul affirms respecting the consciousness of guilt universally awakened by the law, that it could only call forth a sense of sin and of deserved punishment; we cannot separate a single act from the whole life, if with Paul we refer everything to the animating disposition, and do not form our estimate according to the outward value of good works. Where the whole of the internal life was not animated by that which must be the principle of all true goodness, that principle could not perfectly operate even for a single moment. Still, the repressed higher nature of man, the seat of the law of God, gave more or fewer signs of its existence.

From the Jewish and from the Gentile points of view alike, there was only one mode of transition to a state of salvation, the consciousness of an inward disunion between the divine and the undivine in human

nature, and proceeding from that, the consciousness of the need of redemption. And hence there are two hindrances which obstruct the attainment of salvation by men; either the gross security of heathenism, where the higher movements of life are entirely suppressed by the dominion of sinful pleasure, or the Jewish merit of works and self-righteousness, where men, pacifying their consciences by the show of devotion and of fulfilling the law, deceive themselves, and suppose that, by the mechanism of outward religious exercises, or by the performance of certain actions which wear the appearance of good works, they have attained the essence of the holiness required by the divine law. In reference to the latter, Paul says of the Jews, Rom. x. 3, that since they knew not the essence of true holiness which avails before God and can be imparted by God alone, and since they esteemed their own works to be genuine holiness—they could not perceive the insufficiency of these, and hence they could not appropriate the holiness revealed and imparted by God.* As the manner in which the Jews, insensible of their need of divine aid, endeavored to attain holiness by the observance of the law, was their cause of not attaining it; so on the other hand the heathen—those, namely, in whom self-conceit of another kind had not been produced by a philosophical training—since no such spiritual pride counteracted the feeling of the need of redemption in their minds, when once through particular circumstances, inward experiences, or perhaps through the preaching of the gospel,† the voice of the law had become louder and more emphatic within them—were easily awakened to this feeling of helplessness, and thus led to faith in the Redeemer.‡

In another respect also, Paul compares the Jewish and the heathen or Grecian points of view with one another. Among the Jews, the predominance of the sensuous element in their religious life, a tendency of spirit, which, being unsusceptible of the internal revelation of divine power, sought for extraordinary events in the world of the senses as marks of the divine, a tendency which he distinguished by the name of

* The phrase "God's righteousness," *δικαιοσύνη τοῦ θεοῦ*, denotes, in this passage, a righteousness which avails before God, and originates with him, in opposition to one which men suppose may be attained by their own power and works, and which, though men may deceive themselves by false appearances, cannot stand in the sight of a holy, omniscient God. It denotes, accordingly, the manner in which men are justified through faith in Christ, in opposition to the righteousness of the law or of works. The apostle uses the expression "have submitted," *ὑπετάγησαν*, since he considers the cause of their not receiving what God is willing to bestow, to be a spirit of insubordination, a want of humility and acquiescence in the divine arrangements.

† Which, in this connexion, must present itself at first as a revelation of the divine wrath against sin. Rom. i. 18.

‡ Hence, naturally, as among the Jews it was precisely their "following after the law of righteousness," *διωκεῖν νόμον δικαιοσύνης*, which was the cause of their not attaining true righteousness, so among the heathen their "not following after," *μὴ διωκεῖν*, was the cause of their more easily attaining it. Rom. ix. 30, 31.

sign-seeking, was opposed to faith in a crucified Redeemer, who had appeared in "the form of a servant." This revelation of the power of God, where the sensuous man could perceive only weakness and ignominy, must have been a stumbling-block to their sign-seeking minds, which longed for a Messiah in visible earthly glory, as the founder of a visible kingdom. Among the educated portion of the Greeks, on the contrary, that one-sided tendency, which sought only for the satisfaction of a love of knowledge in a new religion,—the one-sided predominance of speculation, the intellectual tendency—the tendency which Paul designated *wisdom-seeking* and philosophical conceit—opposed faith in that preaching which did not begin with the solution of intellectual difficulties, but with offering satisfaction to hearts that longed for the forgiveness of sin and sanctification; hence to this class of persons, the doctrine which did not fulfil the expectations of their wisdom-seeking tendency, and demanded the renunciation of their imaginary wisdom, must have appeared as foolishness; 1 Cor. i. 22, 23.* Thus Paul said in reference to the Greeks, 1 Cor. iii. 18, He who thinks himself wise, let him become a fool, that he may be able to find true wisdom in the gospel; and to the Jews his mode of thought required that the same thing, with a change of reference, should be said: He who esteems himself righteous must first become in his own eyes a sinner, that he may find in the gospel true righteousness. Thus must nations as well as individuals be brought, through their own experience, to a sense of the insufficiency of their own wisdom and righteousness, in order, by feeling their need of help, to be in a suitable state for receiving that redemption which was prepared for all mankind; Rom. xi. 32. The whole history of mankind has redemption for its object, and there are, according to the measure of the diversified stages of human development, diversified degrees of preparation; this is the central point to which the whole history of man tends, where all the threads in the development of individual generations and nations meet. According to this must be our understanding of what Paul says, that God sent his Son into the world in the fulness of time, Gal. iv. 4, as also of his language when he speaks, Eph. iii. 9, of the mystery of redemption as hidden from eternity in God, and of the purpose which God had before the world was, Eph. i. 4, and which was to be fulfilled in the dispensation of the fulness of time, Eph. i. 10. In the divine counsels he could not suppose there was a before and after; but by this mode of expression he marks the internal relation of the divine counsels and works to each other, the actual establishment of the kingdom of God among men by redemption, the final aim of the whole earthly creation by which its destiny will first be completely fulfilled. This globe is created and destined for the purpose of being the seat of the kingdom of God, of being animated by the kingdom of God, the body of which the kingdom of God is the soul. The end of all created existence is that it may con-

* See also pages 165, 192.

tribute to the glory of God, or to reveal God in his glory. But in order that this may be really accomplished, it must be with consciousness and freedom, and these are qualities which can be found only in an assemblage of rational beings. It is such an assemblage, therefore, which is distinguished by the name of the kingdom of God; and when the reason of the creature has been brought by sin into a state of contrariety with the end of its existence, redemption is a necessary condition of establishing the kingdom of God on this globe. If we bear in mind, what we have before remarked in the Pauline connexion of ideas, the destination of man to a development towards an imperishable life, the conception also here naturally follows that, although there would have been no need of redemption for man without sin, yet something was reserved for him answering to the glorification of human nature through Christ.

Paul could not indeed have represented human nature under the aspect of its need of redemption in this manner, if he had not been led to the depths of self-knowledge by his own peculiar development. But so far was he from mingling a foreign element with the doctrine of Christ, that from his own experience he has drawn a picture which every man, who like Paul has striven after holiness, must verify from his self-knowledge; it is a picture, too, the truth of which is presupposed by the personal instructions of Christ, as we shall find by reading merely the first three Gospels. We gather this, not so much from single expressions of Christ respecting the constitution of human nature, as from the representations he gives of himself and of the work he had to accomplish in relation to mankind.* When he compares Christianity to leaven which is designed to leaven the whole mass into which it is cast, he intimates the necessity of transforming human nature by a new higher element of life which is infused into it by Christianity. Christ calls himself the Physician of mankind; he says that he came only for the sick, for sinners; Matt. ix. 13; Luke v. 32. It is impossible that by such language he could intend to divide men into two classes—the sick, those who were burdened with sin, and who needed his aid;—and the righteous, those in health and who needed not his assistance or could easily dispense with it; for the persons in reference to whose objections he uttered this declaration, he would certainly have recognised least of all as righteous and healthy. He means rather to say, that as he came only as a Physician for the sick, as a Redeemer for sinners, he could only fulfil his mission in the case of those who, conscious of disease and sin, were willing to receive him as a Physician and Redeemer; that he was come in vain for those who would not acknowledge their need of healing and redemption. Christ, when he sketches the traits of that moral ideal after which his disciples are to aspire, never expresses his reliance on the moral capabilities of human nature, on the powers of reason;† he appeals rather to the

* That the work of Christ presupposes a condition of corruption and helplessness, is acknowledged by De Wette in his *Biblische Dogmatik*, § 246.

† See Life of Christ, p. 104.

consciousness of spiritual insufficiency, the sense of the need of illumination by a higher divine light, of sanctification by the power of a divine life, a need which he promises to satisfy. Hence in the so-called Sermon on the Mount, he begins with pronouncing *blessed* such a tendency of the disposition, since it will surely attain what it seeks; compare Matt. xi. 28. When Christ, Matt. xix., Luke xviii., at first enjoined on the rich man who asked him what he must do to inherit eternal life, to "keep the commandments," it is by no means inconsistent with what Paul asserts of the insufficiency of the works of the law for the attainment of salvation, but is identical with it, only under another form and aspect. Christ wished to lead this individual, who according to the Jewish notions was righteous, to a consciousness that outward conformity to the law by no means involved the disposition that was required for participation in the kingdom of God. The test of renouncing self and the world which he imposed upon him, should have led him who was still entangled in the love of earthly things, though from his youth he had lived in outward conformity to the law, to feel that he was destitute of this disposition. Nor can we, from the expressions in which children are represented as models of the state of mind with which men must enter the kingdom of God, Matt. xix. 14, Luke xviii. 16, infer the doctrine of the incorruption of human nature,* partly because the point of comparison is only the simplicity and compliance of children, the consciousness of immaturity,† the disclaiming of imaginary preëminence, the renunciation of prejudices; and partly because childhood is an age in which the tendency to sin is less developed,‡ but the existence of such a tendency is by no means denied. Still Christ could not have used these and similar expressions (as in Matt. xviii. 10) in commendation of what existed in children as an undeveloped bud, if he had not recognised in them a divine impress, a slumbering, glimmering knowledge of God, which, when brought from the first into communion with Christ, when carried back to its original, should thereby be preserved from the reaction of the sinful principle.§ And the recognition of a something in human nature allied to the divine, is implied in what Christ says of the eye of the spirit, of that which is the light of the inner man, by the relation of which to the source of light, the whole direction and complexion of the life is determined; so that, either by keeping up a connexion with its divine source, light is spread over the life of man, or if the eye be darkened by the prevalence of a

* As Baumgarten Crusius appears to do in his *Biblische Dogmatik*, p. 362.

† See Life of Christ, p. 331.

‡ On this account Paul in 1 Cor. xiv. 20, says "in malice be ye children," *τῇ κακίᾳ νηπιάζετε*.

§ The qualities which Christ attributes to children, are entirely opposed to a harsh Augustinian theology, and the gloomy view of life founded upon it, although this must be recognised as relatively a necessary step in the development of the Christian life, in reference to certain circumstances, and as the root of important phenomena in the history of the church.

worldly tendency, the whole life is involved in darkness.* But as we have seen, Paul presupposes such an undeniable and partially illuminating knowledge of God in human nature, and this assumption is supported by what he says of the various degrees of moral development among mankind.

The idea of the need of redemption leads us to the Work of Redemption accomplished by Christ. Paul distinguishes in the work of Christ, the two factors of his Doing and his Suffering.

Adam and Christ,—the first and the second Man,—these are in Paul's estimation the two poles on which the history of the world turns. As from the one proceeded sin and death, so from the other, righteousness and eternal life. As the one was the progenitor of the earthly humanity laden with sin and subject to death, so the other was the creator of an exalted humanity, formed altogether according to his image. As Adam was the representative of the whole of the human race who were descended from him, so is Christ the representative of the whole, as far as they are willing to enter into communion with him. And now there are two important points to be distinguished in the life of Christ; one is, his appropriating to himself human nature as subject to sin and death; the other, his revealing it in his divine life, and perfectly realizing in it the law of holiness. In both these respects he has rendered satisfaction to the law, enduring what it threatened to sinful humanity fallen under its sentence of condemnation, and fulfilling what it required of that humanity. In both respects, Christ appears as the representative of the whole of mankind, and has conducted himself as such in his suffering and acting; all who belong to him, and, as belonging to him, wish to appear before God, must appropriate what he has done and suffered for them. With a reference to these two distinguishing points, the Doing and the Suffering of Christ, we wish now to consider more attentively Paul's expressions respecting the work of Christ.

In reference to the former, Paul says in Rom. viii. 3, that what was impossible to the law, what it was unable to effect, owing to the predominant sinfulness in human nature, (namely, to destroy the reign of sin in human nature, which the law aimed to effect by its holy commands,) was accomplished by God, when he sent his son into the world in such a human nature as was in all respects like to that which hitherto had been under the dominion of sin, and when he condemned sin, that is, despoiled of its power and supremacy, and manifested its powerlessness in that human nature, over which it had before reigned, in order that the requirements of the law might be fulfilled in believers, as those whose lives were governed, not by sinful desire, but by the Spirit, the divine vital principle of the Spirit that proceeded from Christ.† Paul does not here speak of any particular point in the

* See Life of Christ, p. 106.

† The other interpretation of this passage, according to which it means that Christ bore for men the punishment attached to sin by the law, appears to me not to be favored by the context, for it is most natural to refer "the law could not do," *ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου* in

life of Christ, but contemplates it as a whole, by which the perfect holiness required by the law was realized. Thus the reign of holiness in human nature succeeds to the reign of sin, the latter is now destroyed and the former established objectively in human nature; and from this objective foundation its continued development proceeds. And in no other way can the human race be brought to fulfil their destiny, the realization of the kingdom of God, which cannot proceed from sin and estrangement from God, but must take its commencement from a perfectly holy life, presenting a perfect union of the divine and the human. The Spirit of Christ, from which this realization of the ideal of holiness proceeded in his own life, is also the same by which the life of believers, who are received into his fellowship, is continually formed according to this Archetype. In Rom. v. 18, Paul opposes to the one sin of Adam the one holy work (the *ἐν δικαίῳ*) of Christ. And if, induced by the contrast to the one sin of Adam, he had in view one act especially of Christ, the offering up of himself, as an act of love to God and man, and of voluntary obedience to God, still this single act, even according to Paul's statement, ought not to be considered as something isolated, but as the closing scene in harmony with the whole, by which he completed the realization of the ideal of holiness in human nature, and banished sin from it. Since he, in the method of his polemic against the Jewish doctrine of the desert of good works, always opposed himself so expressly to the isolated, external, quantitative, moral estimate, so could he certainly from this position contemplate every particular in the life of Christ only in connexion with the holy mind which animated his whole life. In this view, indeed, the whole life of Christ may be considered as one holy work. As by one sin, the first by which a commencement was made of a sinful life in the human race, sin, and with sin condemnation and death, spread among all mankind; so from this one holy life of Christ, holiness and a life of eternal happiness resulted for all mankind. This holy life of Christ, God would consider as the act of the human race, but it can only be realized in those who, by an act of free self-determination, appropriate this work accomplished for all, and by this surrender of themselves enter through Christ into a new relation with God; those who through faith are released from the connexion with the life of sin propagated from Adam, and enter into the fellowship of a holy life with Christ. Since they are thus in union with Christ, in the fellowship of his Spirit, for his sake are presented as "just," *δίκαιοι*, before God, they share in all that is indissolubly connected with the holiness of Christ, and in his eternally blessed life, which belongs in like manner to them. In this sense, Paul says that from the one "justification," *δικαίωμα*, of Christ, objective "jus-

the first clause to the "condemned sin," *κατέκρινε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν*, in the last. But this will not suit, if we take the first in the sense of condemning and punishing, for it was precisely this which the law *could* do; but to condemn sin in the sense in which the word is used in John xvi. 11, and xii. 31, the law was prevented from doing by the opposition of the "flesh."

tification," *δικαίωσις*, and the consequent title to "life," *ζωή*, comes upon all (Rom. v. 18); that by the obedience of one many shall be made righteous (v. 19); in which latter passage, he probably blends the objective and the subjective—the objective imputation of the ideal of holiness realized by Christ, founded in the divine counsels, or the manner in which the human race appear in the divine sight—and the consequent subjective realization, gradually developed, which proceeds from faith.

With respect to the second point, *the sufferings of Christ as such*, we find it (not to mention other passages where this idea forms the basis) distinctly stated in two places. In Gal. iii. 13, after the apostle had said that the law only passed sentence of condemnation upon men who had shown that they were guilty of violating it, he adds, that Christ has freed them from this condemnation, since on their account and in their stead* he had borne this condemnation, by suffering the punishment of the cross as a person accursed by the law. The condemnation of the law weighed, according to the external appearance, upon him who yet was perfectly free from its ban, who had rendered perfect satisfaction to its moral requirements. We have already intimated above, how these words, though spoken more immediately in reference to the Jews, have yet at the same time a general significance reaching to the whole human race. The second passage is 2 Cor. v. 21. Him who knew no sin, the sinless one, God has made sin for our sakes; that is, putting the abstract for the concrete, he has made him a sinner, he has allowed him to appear as a sufferer on account of sin, that we might become through him the righteousness of God, that is, such as may appear before God as righteous; that, therefore, as Christ, the Holy One, entered by his sufferings into the fellowship of our guilt, so we sinners enter into the fellowship of his holiness.

In accordance with these views, Paul divided the life of Christ into two parts. At first, Christ presented himself as a weak mortal, although conscious of possessing a divine nature and dignity, submitting to all the wants and limitations of earthly humanity, partaking of all those evils which affect human nature in connexion with sin, and as the punishment of sin, so that in his outward appearance and condition he placed himself entirely on a level with men suffering on account of sin. The consummation of this state was the crucifixion, as the consummation of the misery entailed by sin is in death. The second part, was the life of Christ risen and glorified, in which his unchangeable divine and blessed life reveals itself in perfection, corresponding to that perfect holiness which he manifested on earth—for as sin and death, so are sinlessness and a life of eternal blessedness correlative ideas in Paul's writings; and as in Christ's risen and glorified humanity, that divine, eternal, blessed life is presented which corresponds to perfect holiness, so it is a practical proof that he, in the earlier portion of his life, fulfilled the law of holiness

* Both these ideas may be included in the "for us," *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*.

in and for human nature, and, by enduring the sufferings incurred through sin, effected the release of mankind from guilt and punishment, and has assured to them eternal life, which will be communicated to all who enter into fellowship with him by faith. Thus it is declared in 2 Cor. xiii. 4, that though Christ was crucified owing to human weakness, (the crucifixion was the closing point of his life in the participation of human weakness) yet since his resurrection, he enjoys a life of divine power without any mixture of human weakness. In Rom. vi. 10, the death of Christ is spoken of as bearing a relation to sin—as an event which, but for sin, would not have taken place, and had for its only object the blotting out of sin; and that having perfectly attained that end, it was not to be repeated. The earthly life and sufferings of Christ bear a relation to sin, as being the means of redeeming the human race from it. But now the risen and glorified Saviour, having once completed the redemption of human nature, is separated from all relation to sin and the evils connected with it, and, exalted above all conflicts and earthly weakness, lives in divine power and blessedness, to the glory of God. He no longer endures the sufferings to which human nature became subject by sin, and he needs to perform nothing more for the extinction of sin; his work has been completed once for all. There remains only his positive operation for the glory of God, without the negative reference to the extinction of sin, since this was no longer needed. Conscious of his divinity, he did not eagerly retain (Phil. ii. 6) equality with God for the mere exhibition* of it, but divested himself of the divine glory which appertained to him, presented himself in the form of human dependence, humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the ignominious death of the cross. Wherefore—on account of this perfect obedience rendered under all human weakness and suffering—God has exalted him to the highest dignity and rule in the kingdom of God. In accordance with this train of ideas is Rom. iv. 25, where, as the self-offering of Christ is represented as occurring on account of sin, so his resurrection is adduced as a practical evidence of the freedom from sin and the justification bestowed by him, by virtue of the connexion existing, not only between sin and death, but between righteousness and eternal life. And in reference to the importance of the resurrection of Christ, as an objective proof of the release of human nature from the guilt of sin and the death that it involved, the apostle says in 1 Cor. xv. 17, “If Christ be not risen, ye are yet in your sins.” From this connexion of ideas it follows, that the sufferings of Christ must be always considered in union with his whole life, and as the close and consummation of it; and with a two-

* An illustration of Paul's language may be found in an Epistle of Constantine, relating to some Christians who eagerly seized on an unexpected opportunity of returning from exile to their native country: *Ὅλον ἀρπαγμά τι τὴν ἐπάνοδον ποιησάμενοι*, *Euseb. de Vita Constan.* ii. 31; and the words of Euseb. himself, *Hist. Eccles.* viii. 12, respecting those who preferred death rather than surrender themselves to the heathen: *Τὸν θάνατον ἀρπαγμα θέμενοι τῆς τῶν δυσσεβῶν μοχθηρίας.*

fold reference, which, according to the Pauline doctrine, they bear to the completion of the work of redemption, namely, the appropriation of human guilt, by entering into the suffering condition of man—and the perfect realization of the moral law. And therefore, when Paul speaks of what Christ effected by his blood, his cross, or other means, one single point which forms the consummation and close of the whole stands for that whole, according to a mode of expression common to the sacred writers, since the whole, in its full significance, can be understood only in connexion with that single point.

As the result of this work of Christ for sinful mankind, Paul specifies Reconciliation with God, Redemption, Justification. With respect to the idea of *Reconciliation*, it cannot have been conceived by Paul as if men had been objects of the divine wrath and hatred, till Christ appeasing the divine justice by his sufferings, by his intervention on earth, reconciled an offended God to mankind, and made them again the objects of his love; for the plan of redemption presupposes the love of God towards the race that needed redemption, and Paul considers the sending of Christ, and his living and suffering for mankind, as the revelation of the superabounding love and grace of God; Eph. iii. 19; Titus iii. 4; Rom. v. 8; viii. 32. And this counsel of God's love he represents as eternal, so that the notion of an influence on God produced in time falls to the ground, since the whole life and sufferings of Christ were only the completion of the eternal counsel of divine love. Therefore Paul never says, that God being hostile to men, became reconciled to them through Christ, but that men who were the enemies of God became reconciled to him; Rom. v. 10; 2 Cor. v. 18.* Thus he calls on men to be reconciled to God; 2 Cor. v. 20. The obstacle exists on the side of men, and owing to this they do not receive the revelation of the love of God into their self-consciousness; and since by the redeeming work of Christ this obstacle is taken away, it is said of him that he has reconciled man to God, and made him an object of divine love.

But now from what has been said, we may attach merely a subjective meaning to reconciliation; and the ideas presupposed by it of enmity with God and of God's wrath may appear to be only indications of subjective relations, in which man finds himself in a certain state of disposition towards God—indications of the way and manner in which God presents himself to the conscience of a man estranged from him by sin, or the form in which the knowledge of God must develop itself in con-

* If we only reflect upon the connexion of the objective and the subjective in the doctrine of Paul respecting the reconciliation of men with God, it will easily appear that this passage is not chargeable with that want of logical connexion and clearness of conception, which one of the most noted expositors of the Pauline Epistles—Rückert—fancied that he found in it; the love of truth has, however, led this estimable man to a more correct view, and in the last edition of his able Commentary on the Romans, he has improved his analysis. See the remarks made, further on, on this connexion between the objective and the subjective in reconciliation.

nexion with the consciousness of guilt. Thus by the term reconciliation only such an influence on the disposition of man may be denoted, as that by which it is delivered from its former state, and placed in another relation towards God. Since Christ by his whole life, by his words and works, and especially by his participation in the sufferings of humanity, and by his sufferings for men, has revealed God's love towards those who must have felt themselves estranged from him by sin—and has exhibited his sufferings as a pledge of the forgiving love of God, and his resurrection as a pledge of the eternal life destined for them,—thus he has kindled a reciprocal love and childlike confidence towards God in the souls of those who were unable to free themselves from the state of disquietude of conscience which was produced by the consciousness of guilt. The reconciliation of man to God (according to this view) consists in nothing else than the alteration of the disposition, arising from the revelation of God's love towards fallen humanity, of those who may have received this revelation into their self-consciousness. Still it is supposed that the reconciliation of man to God is not the result of any amendment on the part of the former, but the amendment is the result of the reconciliation, since, through the new determination of the self-consciousness by means of love and confidence towards God, an altogether new direction of the life towards God and away from sin, the source of all true amendment is produced. According to this view also, it is presupposed that man, who feels himself estranged from God by sin, finds in himself no ground of confidence towards God, and requires an objective ground, a practical revelation to which his own self-consciousness can attach itself, in order to excite and support his confidence. This latter is, without doubt, a leading point of the Pauline system, as it is of the doctrine of the New Testament in general. All the exhortations and encouragements of the apostle proceed continually from a reference to the practical revelation of God's redeeming love. Nor can it be a valid objection, on the other hand, that Paul, in 2 Cor. v. 20, addressing those who were already believers, and calling on them to be reconciled to God, meant that by amendment they entered into a new relation to God, and were brought out of their former state of enmity; for it makes here no difference whether Paul is speaking to those who had already professed Christianity, or to those with whom this was not the case. In every case, according to his conceptions, the believing appropriation of the reconciliation of man with God* effected through Christ, was accompanied by a new direction of the life, and where this did not ensue, it was a sign that the believing appropriation had not taken place, and the man was still destitute of that reconciliation with God from which amendment proceeds. In that very passage, Paul does not say, Amend yourselves in order that you may be reconciled to God; but rather, Let not the grace of reconciliation appear to be in vain for you, as if you had not appropriated it.

* This is distinctly marked by his exhortation "be ye reconciled," *καταλλάγητε*.

By Christ's offering up his life for man estranged from God, man is objectively reconciled to God. God has removed that which made the separation between himself and man. But what has been objectively accomplished for all mankind, must now be appropriated by each individual and thus become subjective. Hence, according to these different points of view, Paul could say—"Be ye reconciled (*subjectively*) to God," and "We are reconciled (*objectively*) to God by the death of his Son;" Rom. v. 10.

But as respects that view, in conformity to which the life and sufferings of Christ are considered merely as a manifestation of God's love, and the reconciliation effected by him as the subjective influence of this manifestation on the human heart, it is by no means exhaustive of the meaning of the Pauline declarations already quoted respecting the redemption of Christ. And although the gross anthropopathical notion of God's reconciliation with man, is evidently inconsistent with Paul's train of ideas, it does not follow, that by the word reconciliation, only a subjective change in the disposition of man is denoted, for we are by no means justified in explaining the correlative idea of enmity against God, viz., a wrath of God, merely as subjective, and, among the various disignifying reality merely in the idea of the *love* of God. On the contrary, the common fact of human consciousness, according to which a man addicted to sin feels himself estranged from God, and cannot get rid of the feeling of his guilt and ill-deserts, reveals to us a deeper objective ground in the moral constitution of the universe and in the essence of God, which through this moral constitution reveals itself to us. In this universal fact, we have a witness of the revelation of God's holiness in the consciousness of mankind, which is as undeniable as the revelation of his love. By the "*wrath of God*," though in an anthropopathical form, something objective and real is signified, which is not fully expressed by the idea of punishment, but includes what is the ground of all punishment, (on which account this phrase, "the wrath of God," is sometimes used to express merely punishment,) the ground of the necessary connexion between sin and evil, the absolute contrariety existing between God, as the Holy One, and sin.* God recognises evil as evil, as that which stands in contrariety to his holiness, rebels against him and his holy order, and would exist independent of him. This mode in which God recognises evil, is also a sentence of condemnation upon it, and therein are grounded its powerlessness and wretchedness. Evil is denied, if conceived of as something non-existent to the mind of God, a conception, moreover, which consistently agrees only with an idea of God wholly different from the biblical one, with a mode of thought by which the idea of the Absolute is put in the place of the idea of the Living God.

As now this unhappy relation of man to God is grounded in the

* Compare Twisten's *Dogmatik*, II. i., p. 146.

divine holiness, so also can his freedom from this relation be obtained only in a way answering to the laws of the Divine holiness. The work proceeds only from the compassionate love of God to the fallen; but love acts in harmony with the holiness of God *as holy love*, revealing itself in the work of redemption. This connexion is specially pointed out by Paul in Rom. iii. 25. In this passage, he contrasts the revelation of God's holiness at that time by the publication of the gospel, and the non-punishment of past sins before the appearance of the gospel. By the "remission of sins," *πάρεσις τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων*, and the "forbearance of God," *ἀνοχή τοῦ θεοῦ*, he understands the manner in which the conduct of God appeared to exhibit itself in reference to sin before the publication of the gospel, especially towards the heathen world, which knew nothing of the Old Testament revelations of the holiness of God in opposition to sin, and also towards the Jews, who, notwithstanding these testimonies, by the delay of the final divine judgments for their sins, instead of interpreting the long-suffering of God as a call to repentance, were sunk in carnal security. We may compare with this, Paul's language in Acts xvii. 30, speaking of the times of ignorance that God had overlooked; though this is to be understood only relatively, in reference to the different stages of historical development, for Paul recognised, as we have already shown, in the moral nature of the heathen, a revelation of the divine law, of the divine holiness and punitive justice. But under their peculiar circumstances, there was, from a kind of necessity, a general obscuration of that religious and moral knowledge by which their thinking and acting was regulated. This induced on the part of God a passing over, a non-imputation of offences; since the reckoning taken of transgressions is also determined by the measure of the possible knowledge of the law; Rom. v. 13.* Thus there may be a chargeableness and a non-chargeableness under different aspects, by which the apparent contradictions in Paul's language may be reconciled.

Paul in Rom. iii. 25, declares in general, that for both the Jews and heathens a revelation of the divine wrath must precede the revelation of the grace that forgives sin. The *πάρεσις*† denotes only what was negative and temporary, the non-punishment of past sins on the part of God,‡ so that the sense of the guilt of sin is not presupposed, and the removal of that sense is not effected. The *ἄφεσις*, on the other hand, denotes, *objectively*, that act of God by which sin is really forgiven, that is, is considered in relation to God and the moral constitution of the universe as not existing; and, *subjectively*, that operation in the heart of man by which it is really freed from the consciousness of guilt. This means far

* See page 402.

† *πάρεσις* and *ἄφεσις* are both rendered "remission" in our English version; but the former denotes rather *pretermission* or *passing by*, and the latter strictly *remission* or *forgiveness*.—Ed.

‡ In scholastic language, *πάρεσις* may be referred to the *voluntas signi*, (will as revealed,) and *ἄφεσις* to the *voluntas beneplaciti*, (will as immanent.)

more than the non-punishment of sin during a certain period. In those to whom this act of God relates, the consciousness of guilt and of divine wrath, *ὀργή*, the subjective revelation of the divine punitive justice, is presupposed; and the operation that takes place in their dispositions necessarily implies forsaking a life of sin, and the renunciation of all fellowship with sin. According to the connexion of ideas in Paul's mind, we are led to view the subject as follows: in contrast with that former apparent overlooking of sin on the part of God, the holiness of God is at this time manifested by his openly exhibiting Christ, through his offering up of himself, as a reconciler or sin-offering for the sins of mankind, so that he verifies himself as the Holy One, and permits every one to appear before him as holy,* who shows that he is in fellowship with Christ by faith. The holiness of God manifests itself (according to the Pauline connexion of ideas already noticed) in the life and death of Christ in a twofold manner. First, inasmuch as he completely realized (in opposition to sin which had hitherto been predominant in human nature) that holy law to which the life of man was designed to correspond,—made satisfaction to the moral order of the universe and the honor of God, and glorified God in that nature which was originally designed to glorify him. God has verified himself as the Holy One, since he forgives sin only on the condition of the perfect fulfilment of the law; he has shown that he remits nothing from the requirements of perfect holiness, and we always bear in mind that this remission, to those who through it obtained justification, is not a mere outward act, but becomes in all the cause and pledge of the complete fulfilment of the law. Secondly, inasmuch as Christ, as perfectly holy, underwent those sufferings which the divine holiness, considered as punitive justice† in its opposition against sin, had suspended over human nature. We are not to conceive of this,

* That we ought not to translate *δίκαιος* *righteous*, but *holy*, appears from that meaning of this word which lies at the basis of *δικαιοῦν*, to declare a person *δίκαιος*.

† That divine attribute which reveals itself in the necessary connexion of sin and evil, is founded in the reaction of the holiness of God against sin (= the wrath of God), and exhibits itself in the reaction of the moral order of the universe against wickedness, whence punishment proceeds. To conceive of punishment as merely reformatory, and to suppose such a conception to be exhaustive of its meaning, is to degrade rational creatures and to regard morality as a purely mechanical production. But if punishment is viewed at first as a revelation of the divine justice, as an objective reaction of the moral order of the universe against evil, another mode of viewing it also presents itself, according to which the punishment, necessary in itself, is appointed by the love of God, in order, since punishment and sin stand in this internal connexion with one another, to lead thereby to a consciousness of sin and guilt, to make rational creatures sensible of the relation they stand in to the moral world, and thus to call forth the feeling of the need of redemption. The self-will which rebels, in sin, against the moral order of the universe and God's holy law, must be humbled, by suffering, before the holy omnipotence of God and the majesty of the moral order of the universe and of law. Where submission is not yielded freely, it will be compelled. Without the idea of punishment, the reality of evil and the dignity of rational creatures cannot be acknowledged. It belongs to the privileges of rational beings created in the likeness of God, and distinguishes them from other existences in nature, that the idea of pun-

as if God arbitrarily imposed these sufferings, or Christ had arbitrarily subjected himself to them; but that it was naturally grounded on the assumption of human nature in its present condition and relation to God—as the divine punitive justice revealed itself to them who were suffering the consequences of sin—and thus it was accomplished through the historical development of the life of Christ devoted to conflict with the sin that reigned in the human race, and through his condescending to their condition from the sympathy of love.*

With the idea of reconciliation, the ideas of “redemption,” “salvation,” “justification,” ἀπολύτρωσις, σωτηρία, δικαίωσις, are closely connected. The two first terms are used in a wider and a narrower sense; they denote the deliverance from the guilt and punishment of sin, the “salvation from wrath,” σωτηρία ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς, the original, negative moment, with which also the positive is necessarily given, Rom. v. 9, first objectively as what has been gained by Christ for the human race; and then subjectively, what is effectuated by progressive development in each individual by personal appropriation, from his first entrance into fellowship with the Redeemer to the complete participation in the Redeemer’s glory and blessedness in the perfected kingdom of God; but more especially what belongs to the perfect realization of the last idea, the complete freedom from sin and all its consequences, from all evil both natural and moral.†

With respect to the idea of Justification, in order to determine it, we must refer to what we have already remarked on the Pauline opposition to the common Jewish notion of righteousness; (see p. 383.) He sets out from the same point as his adversaries, as far as he considers the participation in all the privileges and blessings of the kingdom of God indissolubly connected with “righteousness,” the genuine theocratic disposition and condition of life. Therefore the correlative idea of

ishment finds its application in them. See the excellent remarks of Twosten, in his *Dogmatik*, II. i. p. 148.

* The Pauline view of the work of redemption finds its point of connexion with Christ’s words in the first Gospels, in Matt. xx. 28, whether we consider “ransom,” λύτρον, as a sum paid for release from captivity or slavery, or for redemption from deserved punishment; also in the institution of the Holy Supper, (in which he evidently alluded to the connection between the Passover and the establishment of the Old Covenant,) which by the offering of himself to obtain and confirm the forgiveness of sins to mankind, marked the establishment of the New Covenant. The Pauline views are also supported by the manner in which Christ adopts the ideas of the wrath of God and of punitive justice from the Old Testament, without casting a doubt on their validity. The parable of the Lost Son, and other expressions which relate to forgiving love, offer no contradiction, but mark precisely the side on which God reveals himself in the work of redemption, and what, humanly speaking, could be the only motive to such an act of God towards a race estranged from him by sin; they do not, however, determine the manner in which the result designed by divine love is to be attained; the form and order followed by the compassionate love of God, for the love of God acts only as a holy and righteous love.

† ἀπολύτρωσις is found in the latter sense in Rom. viii. 23; Eph. i. 14; and σωτηρία in the latter sense in Rom. xiii. 11; 1 Peter i. 5.

righteousness in this sense was blessedness, the participation of the blessings promised through Abraham to all his posterity, the fulfilment of all the promises relating to the kingdom of God, all the privileges of the children of God; and an entrance into all the relations in which they stand to God. But Paul maintained against the Jews and Judaizers, that by the law and the working of the law, no one could attain this "righteousness," *δικαιοσύνη*, could present himself as "righteous," *δίκαιος*, before God, and enter into the relation with God founded upon it; but that every man appears as a sinner in God's sight, till entering by faith into fellowship with Christ (the only perfect *δίκαιος* by whom mankind are delivered, in the way that we have described, from the state of *ἀμαρτία*), he presents himself in union with Christ (*ἐν Χριστῷ*) as "righteous" before God, and enters into the entire relation with God implied in this predicate, is viewed by God as "righteous," and established in all the privileges connected with this idea (*δικαιούται*). Consequently, Paul includes in the idea of "justification," *δικαίωσις*, that act of God, by which he places the believer in Christ in the relation to himself of a righteous person, notwithstanding the sin that still cleaves to him. Righteousness denotes, then, the subjective appropriation of this relation, the appearing righteous before God, by virtue of faith in the Redeemer, and also the whole new tendency and aim of life inseparable from faith, as well as that whole new relation to God now received into the consciousness, which is also necessarily connected with faith; the righteousness or perfect holiness of Christ appropriated by faith, as the *objective* ground of confidence for the believer, and also as a new *subjective* principle of life. Thus the righteousness of faith in the Pauline sense includes the essence of a new disposition; and hence the idea of righteousness may easily pass into the idea of holiness, though the two ideas are originally distinct. Accordingly, it is not any arbitrary act on the part of God, as if he regarded and treated as sinless a man persisting in sin, simply because he believes in Christ; but the *objective* on the part of God, corresponds to the *subjective* on the part of man, namely, faith, and this necessarily includes in itself a release from the state inherited from Adam, from the whole life of sin, and the entrance into spiritual fellowship with the Redeemer, the appropriation of his divine life. As the realization of the archetype of holiness through Christ, contains the pledge that this shall be realized in all those who are one with him by faith, and are become the organs of his Spirit; so its germ and principle are already imparted to them in believing, although the fruit of a life perfectly conformed to the Redeemer, can only be developed gradually in its temporal manifestation. What comes gradually to pass in time, appears to the eye which is not shut in by the limits of time as something already completed; all that in the beginning lies in the germ and the principle, all that will proceed thence, is presented as already present. The connexion of these ideas will be rendered clearer by developing the Pauline idea of faith.

What Paul distinguished by the name of Faith, has its root in the depths of the human heart. It presupposes a revelation of God in a direct relation to man, and faith is the reception and vital appropriation of this divine revelation by virtue of a receptivity for the divine in the human disposition, of a tendency grounded in human nature and the need implanted in it for believing in the supernatural and divine, without which tendency and need, man, however his other faculties might be cultivated, would be no more than *an intelligent animal*.* Something must be presented as an object of knowledge, but this object must be of a kind that can be correctly recognised and understood only by the disposition; it presupposes a certain tendency of the disposition, in order to be known and understood, while it also tends to produce a decided and enduring tendency of the disposition. An inward self-determination of the spirit, grounded in the direction of the will, is claimed by this object, while a new and constant self-determination is produced by it.

It is not in reference to the object of faith, but to the inward subjective significance of this act of the inner man, as that which forms the characteristic of true piety in all ages, that Paul compares the faith of Abraham with the faith of Christians, Rom. iv. 19, ff., where he exhibits Abraham as a pattern of the righteousness of faith. When Abraham received a promise from God, of which the fulfilment seemed to be incompatible with the natural order of things, he raised himself by an act of faith above this impediment, and the word of the Almighty which held forth something invisible, had greater influence upon him than that order of nature which presented itself to his understanding and bodily senses. Hence this faith, as a practical acknowledgment of God in his almighty creative activity, which no law of nature binds, and as a reference of his whole life to the sense of his dependence on God, was a true honoring of God:† and it was this faith which gave its peculiar significance and character to the life of Abraham. This faith, says Paul, was counted to him by God for righteousness; that is, although Abraham was not sinless, (as no man is), yet through this tendency of his inward life by virtue of his faith, he entered into the relation to God of a righteous man; and this was no arbitrary, nominal act on the part of God, but his faith was viewed by God, to whom the inward soul of man is manifest, as a state of the moral disposition by which Abraham became susceptible of all divine communications, and from which alone the sanctification of his whole life could proceed.‡

It is evident that Paul attaches no foreign meaning to the passage in Gen. xv. 6, but only from the special case develops a general idea con-

* A state to which the intellectual fanaticism of a party in the present age, zealous for the pretended autonomy of reason, seeks to degrade man.

† A "giving glory to God," *διδόναι δόξαν τῷ θεῷ*. Rom. iv. 20.

‡ The "therefore," *οὖν*, in Romans iv. 22, points to this connexion. Wherefore, as faith includes all this, as the apostle had before explained, it was imputed to Abraham as "righteousness," *δικαιοσύνη*, as if the *δικαιοσύνη* had already been completed by it.

tained in it, a general law lying at its base. It is the law, on which, for the right relation of man to God, in the surrender of the soul to him through faith everything depends. This inward act of the spirit by which the whole direction of the life is determined toward God and from God, Paul presents in opposition to the religious externality of Jewish conceptions, which would, even in reference to Abraham's position in the Theocracy, lay the greatest stress on the work or external rite of circumcision. The meaning also of the Old Testament passage is no other than this, that God accepted the Faith, the believing confidence of Abraham, as a proof of the right state of his disposition,—regarded him on account of it as "righteous," *צדיק*, and established him in the whole relation that was founded on it. Paul lays a stress upon the fact that it was so imputed to him by God, and he thus presupposes what he might as a general truth, that Abraham was as little as ever a sinless and, in that sense, a righteous man, and hence he concludes that what was wanting to him in subjective righteousness would be compensated by the faith which so availed before God, that he, on account of it, was treated as a righteous man. He also distinguishes expressly (following the historical references) the object of faith in Abraham, Rom. iv. 18, from what is the object of faith in Christians, but also brings forward the analogy between the two. The faith of Abraham had relation to the divine omnipotence in raising the dead to a new life, and in granting a numerous posterity to one who was past age; the faith of Christians has relation to what also is opposed to sensible appearances—that a man laden with sins should appear before God as righteous, that the spiritually dead are awakened to a new life, and as a pledge of this, something which also can only be an object of faith, namely, that act of the divine omnipotence by which Christ who died for the sins of the world has been raised to a life exalted above all death.

As respects the peculiarity of Christian faith, this presupposes the consciousness of sin, the renunciation of any merits of our own before God, the longing after freedom from the dominion of sin, and our not yielding to despair even under the most vivid sense of sinfulness,* but confiding in the grace of redemption; thus there is an entrance into communion with the Redeemer, and a new principle of life is received which more and more penetrates and transforms the whole old nature.

As far as faith includes entering into vital fellowship with the Redeemer, and forsaking the old life of sin, it bears a special reference to the two chief points in which Christ presents himself as Redeemer, as the one who died for the salvation of men, and who also by his resurrection gives assurance of an eternal divine life: hence the two-fold reference of faith to Jesus the Crucified and the Risen, the negative and positive side of faith in relation to the old life which it renounces, and to the new life which it lays hold of; it is the spiritual act by virtue of which, in sur-

* In this respect, *πιστεύειν παρ' ἐλπίδα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι*. Rom. iv. 18.

rendering ourselves to him who died for us, we die to a life of sin, to the world, to ourselves, to all which we were before,—whether we were Jews or Gentiles—and rise again in his fellowship, in the power of his Spirit, to a new life devoted only to him and animated by him. Hence it appeared to the apostle, as he develops the sentiment in the sixth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, an absolute contradiction for any one to say that he believed in the Redeemer and yet to continue in his old life of sin. How shall we—he asks—we who (by the act of faith) are dead to sin, live any longer therein? And he demonstrates from the nature of faith in its reference to the death and resurrection of Christ, that faith cannot exist without a renunciation of the former sinful life and the beginning of a new divine life.

From the nature of faith as the governing principle of the Christian life, arises the peculiarity of Christianity in its relation to Judaism as a system of Legalism; and the various indications of this contrariety serve more distinctly to characterise the nature of faith as the fundamental principle of the Christian life, on which account we wish to consider the subject more in detail.

The law always presents itself as imperative, and makes the salvation of men dependent on the perfect fulfilment of all its commands. "Do all this, and thou shalt live."* But since no one can fulfil these conditions, the law can only produce despair. But the gospel addresses the man who despairs of himself: Do not give thyself up to the feeling of despair. Ask not† how thou canst make the impossible, possible. Thou needest only to receive the salvation prepared for thee; only believe, and thou hast with thy faith all that is needful for thy inward life. Paul

* Here also we must distinguish between the literal meaning of the words, in their direct historical reference, and the general idea lying at their basis; likewise between the νόμος as an external theocratic State-law, and the νόμος according to its internal meaning as an expression in a particular form of the eternal moral law, the law for the universal kingdom of God both in the letter and spirit. In the one case, we speak of the commands of the State-law as such, which the citizens are really able to fulfil, and the living happily in the earthly Theocracy is made dependent on such fulfilment; in the other case, we speak of the fulfilling of the moral law, the internal theocratic law, to which satisfaction can be given by nothing less than universal, unconditional obedience, and the endless life of blessedness in the universal kingdom of God which is made dependent on such an obedience. This is a condition which no man in the present state is able to fulfil.

† That interpretation of this passage, Rom. x. 5–10, which supposes it to express the opposition between Belief and Doubt, appears to me to be opposed by the connexion, which leads us to expect a contrast of the righteousness by faith with the righteousness by works, the θεοῦ δικαιοσύνη with the ἰδία in verse 3; to be opposed by the meaning of the phrase "that is," τοῦτ' ἐστί, in verse 6, which, from comparing Rom. ix. 8, and other similar Pauline expressions, must be understood as—"this is equivalent to saying;" and to be opposed, furthermore, by the relation of the Pauline words to the Old Testament quotation, since, according to the interpretation we have adopted, the Pauline application admirably suits, in spirit and ideas, the meaning of the Mosaic words, which is not the case with the other interpretation.

admirably illustrates this by applying to it the passage in Deut. xxx. 12.* Say not to thyself, Who shall ascend to heaven and prepare a path for me thither? For Christ has descended from heaven and has prepared such a path. To ask such a question, is to desire that Christ would descend again from heaven for thy sake. But say not, Who shall descend for me to the regions of the dead and deliver me thence? Christ has risen from the dead and has delivered thee from the power of death. To ask this, is to desire that Christ might now rise from the dead for thy sake, as if he were not already risen. Instead of asking such questions, only let the gospel be cherished with vital power in thy heart;—believe in Him who descended from heaven and rose from death, and thus obtained salvation for thee. Whoever has this faith is truly pious and may be assured of salvation.”†

Viewed in the light of legal Judaism, the commandments appeared as merely an outward counteraction of the internal corruption of man, which refused to be cured from without; it was only rendered more apparent by the law; hence the letter only tended to death; it called forth the consciousness of spiritual death and of merited unhappiness, 2 Cor. iii. 6, ff. The law in reference to the effect which it must produce in consciousness, could be described only as a law of the letter, of condemnation, of death, of sin, (*νόμος γράμματος, κατακρίσεως, θανάτου, ἀμαρτίας.*‡) But when from faith in the Redeemer a new divine principle of life proceeds, when from faith in the redeeming fatherly love of God a child-like love develops itself as the free impulse of a life devoted to God, when, instead of the former opposition between the human and the divine will, a union is formed between them—then the law no longer appears as a written code, outwardly opposing a will estranged from God, but the spirit of the law is transfused into the internal life of the believer. The indwelling divine life of itself impels them to the fulfilment of all that the law demands. The life-giving spirit, harmonizing with the law,

* This passage certainly refers to the Mosaic religious institutions, and the words are fitted to distinguish them in their simple religious and moral character from the other religions of the East. But as far as the law, understood according to its own spirit, made certain requirements which it gave no power to fulfil, Paul might justly apply these words to mark the peculiar Christian position, might find an idea here expressed which is only realized by Christianity, and is thus prophetic of what Christianity alone accomplishes.

† Rom. x. 5. If Paul, in the second member of the contrast, has not opposed Christ to Moses, and employed Christ's own words—and such, no doubt, might have been found among the traditionary expressions of Christ which would have been specially fit to mark this contrast—it does not follow that he was unacquainted with any collection of the discourses of Christ, or that he could not suppose any such work to be known by the Christians at Rome, for his object was answered by borrowing from the Mosaic writings a motto for the righteousness of faith, which would first find its proper fulfilment in the gospel.

‡ It was perfectly consonant with the Pauline views to distinguish the law by these predicates, though it may be doubted whether, in Rom. viii. 2, the Mosaic law is intended by the word *νόμος*.

occupies the place of the dead and death-producing letter. In the love developed from faith, there is a voluntary fulfilment of the law proceeding from the disposition, instead of actions the result of outward compulsion. In a different sense from that in which Paul, speaking as a natural man, says that he had the law written *on* his heart, he says, speaking as a believer, that he carried the law of God *in* his heart—for, to the natural man, the law, even though internal, presents itself as the command of a foreign, higher voice, of a holy power which man is forced to acknowledge in opposition to his corrupted will; hence, it remains a deadly letter, whether we consider it as an external law or an internal revelation. On the contrary, in believers, the divine law, by virtue of the new spirit of life, the Holy Spirit imparted by Christ, appears not merely as an object of *knowledge* and *recognition*, but of an efficacious love practically influencing the life; it has become an inward law of life. In this sense, Paul says to believers, "Ye need not that I write unto you, for ye yourselves are taught of God," 1 Thess. iv. 9; and this teaching does not signify something addressed to the faculty of acquiring knowledge, but a real internal effect on the springs of action. From what has been said, we may learn in what sense Paul said of the law in reference to its *moral* not less than to its *ritual* contents, that it was abrogated for believers, that they were dead to it, and placed beyond its jurisdiction;* and as we have before remarked, no such distinction in reference to its perpetuity can be made in the νόμος. The law is abrogated for the believer, and he is in every respect dead to it, in so far as it was a compulsory, imperative, accusing code, in so far as righteousness and life were to be sought for by the fulfilment of its commands. To the believer, indeed, justification and salvation, independent of every law, are certain through faith in the grace of redemption.† The law can produce only outward works‡ by its compulsory enactments, but not those internal determinations of the life, which form the essence of true piety—these proceed of themselves, in the believer, from the new animation by the Divine Spirit—the Christian virtues are the fruits of the Spirit, and those in whom these qualities, unattainable by the aid of the law alone, are formed, are even thereby exalted above the stand-

* The being dead to the law, Rom. vii. 4, and Gal. ii. 19, the removal of the law in its whole extent, Colos. ii. 14; for "the handwriting of ordinances," which Christ nailed to his cross, is manifestly the law, and in this particular passage it is safer to suppose the moral requirements of the law to be meant, since it was precisely because no one was able to keep the law, that it was a "handwriting" "which was against us, which was contrary to us." It would accordingly be altogether consonant with the Pauline views, to understand the figurative expression in Rom. vii. 2, of the deadness of the law itself, (namely, this law in its outward theocratic form,) though other exegetical reasons might oppose this interpretation of the passage in Colos. ii. 14.

† The "righteousness of God," δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ,—opposed to the δικαιοσύνη ἀνθρωπίνη, ἰδίᾳ, ἐξ ἔργων, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου—"without the law," χωρὶς νόμου; Rom. iii. 21.

‡ The "works of the law," ἔργα νόμου, which are not "good works," ἔργα ἀγαθά.

point of the law which as a dead letter opposes the principle of corruption prevailing within.* But it by no means contradicts this relation of the law to the life of the believer, that Paul sometimes brings forward moral precepts as quotations from the law, (*νόμος*), for he considers the Mosaic law as an expression of the eternal law of God in a particular, temporary form, adapted to a particular, outward Theocracy, in which the civil arrangements were externally subordinated to the religious, and hence both were intermixed.† The whole substance of the eternal law of God lies at the basis of the *νόμος*, though according to views before stated it was presented in the form of a theocratic national law, which checked its free and complete development. The obligatory force of the commands borrowed from the *νόμος* by Paul, therefore, does not consist in their belonging to that *νόμος*, but that they formed a part of the eternal law, from which they were transferred to the peculiar form presented in the Old Testament, and the inner meaning of this eternal law to which the moral consciousness of men bears witness, is divested of its national garb,‡ by the spirit of the gospel, and developed with greater clearness by the illumination of the Holy Spirit. And when in Rom. xiii. 8, he appeals to the one command of love belonging to the law, he marks exactly the difference between the Christian position and the legal; for if the spirit of love animates believers, and with love is given the fulfilment of the whole law, it follows that the law is no longer for them a compulsory, death-producing letter; and here is exemplified the truth of Christ's assertion that he came not to destroy but to fulfil the law.

Though the idea of the law in that narrower sense, forms the distinctive mark between Judaism and the Gospel, still there is no inconsistency in applying the term§ in a wider sense, to denote the common relation in which both religions stand to the life of man.|| Both religions aim at a control over the life, and give a peculiar character to it. Legal Judaism aims at producing this by literal commands from without; Christianity aims at forming it from within through faith, and the spirit that proceeds from it. In the former case, the law is outward; in

* See Gal. v. 22, 23. It is worth while to compare what Aristotle says in his *Politics*, iii. 13, that an individual cannot belong to a State as a member, if by his preëminence he is raised above the whole body; for such an one is like a god in his relations to men: ὥσπερ γὰρ θεὸν ἀνθρώποις ἐκδὸς εἶναι τὸν τοιοῦτον. The laws are not for such persons; they are a law themselves: κατὰ δὲ τῶν τοιούτων οὐκ ἔστι νόμος· αὐτοὶ γὰρ εἰσι νόμος. Hence ostracism in States that would endure no inequality. A remarkable prophecy for the kingdom of God and Christianity!

† Compare remarks above, p. 421.

‡ To this release of the spirit confined in this garb, to the inward as contrasted with the outward theocratic law, we must refer the antithetical expressions in the Sermon on the Mount, which certainly are directed not merely against the Pharisaic expositions, but also against the letter of the law in its theocratic national form. See *Life of Christ*, 223, 231.

§ I cannot agree with those expositors who think that, when Paul describes Christianity as a *νόμος*, the general idea of law must be altogether given up.

|| See above, p. 401.

the latter, it is inward, such a law as dwells in the new life itself, just as in every particular essence the law of its own peculiar course of development is inborn.* In reference to these various uses of the term law, Paul endeavors to guard against the misconception that because Christians no longer live *under* the law, they are in a lawless state; 1 Cor. ix. 21. They have still a law, the law of God, the law of Christ, not merely outward, but inward, entering into the very essence of the Christian life; and this distinction is marked by the phrases living *under* the law, and *in* the law. Hence also Christianity contrasted with Judaism is called a law, and in explanation of the term so applied, we find accompanying terms such as "law of faith," "law of life," "law of the spirit," (*νόμος πίστεως, νόμος ζωῆς, νόμος πνεύματος.*)

The different relations of the two theocratic points of view are clearly connected with the different applications of the idea of law; the outward conception of the idea of the kingdom of God with the outward conception of the idea of law, and with the inward conception of that idea of law the idea of the Theocracy, as not outwardly constituted but developing itself from within; and thus throughout we meet with the contrast of the inward and the outward. On the legal Jewish standpoint, there was an outward submission to the will of God, the outward observance of the divine commands, without the opposition between the human and divine commands being taken away; the serving God in the oldness of the letter, (*δουλεύειν θεῷ ἐν παλαιότητι γράμματος,*) in the old state of a nature estranged from God, of which nothing can be altered from without by the mere letter of the command. To the believer, the *δουλεία* is inward, so that in the new state, by virtue of the inward renovation which proceeds from the influence of the Divine Spirit, the sanctified will determines itself in dependence on God, it is a servant of God (*δουλεύειν ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος.*) Hence "service," *δουλεία*, in the latter sense, is voluntary and one with true freedom; 1 Cor. vii. 22. *Δουλεία* in the first sense, forms a contrast to the freedom of the children of God; on the contrary, *δουλεία* in the second sense, cannot exist without "adoption," *υἱοθεσία*, and is at once a consequence and a mark of it, for what distinguishes the children from the servants of the family is this, that they do not obey their father's will, as foreign to themselves, but make it their own; dependence on him is, as it were, the natural element of their life. That merely outward servitude to which there is a continuous inward opposition, proceeds from the spirit of fear, the special characteristic of servitude; this inward service proceeds from the consciousness of communion with God obtained through Christ the Son

* By Christianity or Regeneration, goodness is again communicated to the very nature of man, and thus the moral law becomes a higher law of nature appropriated with freedom. We may here apply what Schleiermacher says in his *Academical Essay*, 1825, on the difference between the law of nature and the moral law, without adopting the views of the venerated author respecting the relation of the law to the deviations from it, and in general the relation of the law to freedom as viewed from an ethical point of view.

of God, and of participation in his Spirit, the spirit of childlike relation to God, the spirit of adoption and of love. The Spirit of the Son, the Spirit whose entire fulness is in the Son, and who goes forth from the Son upon all standing in fellowship with him, this Spirit, through whom we enter into the same relation to God as the Son, communicates the consciousness that, in fellowship with him who is the absolute Son of God, we have become and are the children of God. The Spirit of the Son exhibits itself as the spirit of Sonship in all who have part in it. Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 6.

So likewise the worship of God in the spirit of Legalism* was an outward worship (*σαρκικῇ, κατὰ σάρκα*, by means of *ἔργα σαρκικὰ*) consisting in single outward acts,† confined to certain times and places.

* This is true of the legal-moral, as well as of the legal-ritual cultus.

† Connected with the being "in bondage under the elements of the world," *δεδουλωσθαι ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*. We wish to offer a few remarks in vindication and confirmation of the interpretation of this expression given above, (see also p. 401, compare p. 297 n.) and against the common one of *στοιχεῖα* as "the first principles of religious knowledge among men." If the word *στοιχεῖα* meant "first principles," we should naturally expect to find in the genitive connected with it, the designation of the object to which these first principles relate, as is actually done in Hebrews v. 12, "the first principles of the oracles of God," *τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λόγιων τοῦ θεοῦ*. But in the Pauline passages, such a genitive of the object is everywhere wanting, and we find, instead, only a genitive of the subject. The omission of the express mention of such a leading idea can hardly be admitted. Paul, in Gal. iv. 8, plainly addressing those who had formerly been heathens, supposes that, before their conversion, they had been in bondage to these elements of the world, if we do not have recourse to an arbitrary interpretation of *πάλιν*. According to the common interpretation, we must suppose that Paul, by the first elements of religious knowledge, intended to mark a universal idea, in a certain degree applicable alike to both Heathenism and Judaism. But how could this agree with the views of Paul, who recognised Judaism, as subordinate and preparative it is true, but yet a position in religion founded on Divine Revelation, and who, on the other hand, saw in heathenism as such, that is, in idolatry, of which he here speaks, not a subordinate religious position, but something entirely foreign to the nature of religion, a suppression through sin of the original knowledge of God? Neither does the predicate "weak," *ἀσθενῆ*, appear suitable to the idea of the first principles of religion. On the contrary, according to the interpretation I have proposed, all is consistent. The confinement of religion to sensuous forms, and therefore its enthrallment by the elements of the world, is common to Judaism and Heathenism. All idolatry may be considered as a bondage and submission to the elements of sense, and a kind of idolatry may be attributed to the Jews and Judaizers, who sought for the divine, for justification and sanctification, in external rites. This will make it evident how Paul could say to the Galatian Christians, once heathens, who were infected with this Judaism (Gal. iv. 8), "How can ye, who by the divine mercy have been led to the knowledge of God and communion with him (in which interpretation I by no means assume a hophalic sense in the word *γνωσθέντες*, as Usteri, lately deceased, has understood me to do; but, just as he has done, I understand the word in a pregnant sense,) turn back again to the weak and beggarly elements (a suitable description of them, in reference to persons who sought to find in them what the power of God alone could bestow), to which ye desire to bring yourselves again in bondage? (You willingly plunge yourselves back again into your old idolatry.) I fear that I have indeed labored in vain to turn you from idolatry to the worship of the living God." It is quite impossible to join together both significations of the word *στοιχεῖα* as Baur has done, p. 595. If Dr. Baur had fully understood the connexion of my

Worship, on the principle of faith on the contrary, is "spiritual," *πνευματικῇ*, since it proceeds from the inworking of the Divine Spirit, and is completed by the Spirit, Philip. iii. 3 ; hence it does not relate to certain isolated acts, but embraces the whole life; Rom. xii. 1. On the legal principle, men placed their confidence and pride in something human and earthly, whatever it might be, whether descent from the theocratic nation, or the righteousness of the law, or ascetic self-denial and mortification of the flesh, the *κατὰ σάρκα καυχᾶσθαι, ἐν σαρκὶ πεποιθέναι*.* But on the principle of faith, after acknowledging the nullity of all such distinctions, of all human works of righteousness, men place their confidence and glory only in the redemption obtained through Christ; only in that which as believers all have in like manner received from Christ, and are conscious of possessing in fellowship with him; the *ἐν κυρίῳ καυχᾶσθαι*. Here, all imaginary distinctions, all differences vanish, which before separated men from one another, and checked their fellowship in the highest relation of life; everything human is henceforth subordinated to the one spirit of Christ, the common principle of life; Gal. iii. 28. The only universal and constantly available principle of Christian worship which embraces the whole life, is faith in Christ working by love; Gal. v. 6.

Now, in faith is given at once the principle of that whole transformation of the life which proceeds from the Spirit of Christ; through one act of the Spirit man by means of faith dies to the former sinful life, and rises to a new life of communion with Christ. The old man is slain once for all; Rom. vi. 4-6; Coloss. iii. 3. Paul assumes that in Christians, the act by virtue of which they are dead to sin and have crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts, is already accomplished ideally in prin-

ideas, he would not have made his reproaches in p. 595. I find no difficulty whatever in Paul's sometimes placing Heathenism on a level with Judaism, and sometimes below it. This is the case with my own view, nor do I need Dr. Baur's instructions on that point. But this I have felt to be a difficulty, that Judaism as the groundwork of religious development given by God, should be compared with Heathenism. And certainly there is a logical distinction between the two explanations. The being in bondage to the elements of the world,—the dependence of the human mind on nature, the externalizing of religious service—this formed the common error before the existence of Christianity, and was first taken away by its influence. This is the condition of sin through which man has become the slave of nature. This is nothing caused by God. Hence in Heathenism arose the deification of nature, idolatry. The Jews, through the prevalence of Divine Revelation among them, were preserved from such a sinking under the dominion of nature; but Divine Revelation itself, in the education of the theocratic people, condescended to this condition of humanity, above which humanity can only be raised by redemption, and Theism itself has adopted this mode of employing nature and external things; Theism in sensuous forms. Here then, with what is common, is also a contrariety. But it is altogether a different matter, if in reference to a divine education of man, I placed Judaism and Heathenism on a level with one another as constituting the rudiments of religious knowledge. This I cannot help considering as something altogether un-Pauline.

* According to Paul's views, this will apply to the overvaluation of what is human in every form and relation; as, for instance, the Grecian culture and philosophy; see the First Epistle to the Corinthians.

ciple. Hence he concludes, how can they who are dead to sin, live any longer therein? How can they who have crucified the flesh still allow it to rule over them? Rom. vi. 2; Gal. v. 24. But the practice must correspond to the principle; the outward conformation of the life must harmonize with the tendency given to the inward life. Walking in the Spirit must necessarily proceed from living in the Spirit; Gal. v. 25; the former must be a manifestation of the latter. Hence Christians are always required to renew the mortification of the flesh, to walk after the Spirit, to let themselves be animated by the Spirit. The transformation of the old nature in man which proceeds from the divine principle of life received by faith, is not completed in an instant, but can only be attained gradually by conflict with sin; for the renewed as well as the old nature consists of two principles, the "spirit" and the "flesh," only with this difference, that no longer (as Paul represents the state of the natural man in Rom. vii.) the human self with its powerless desires after goodness opposes the principle of sinfulness, the *σὰρξ*, but instead of the human self, there is the divine principle of life which has become the animating one of human nature, the *πνεῦμα θεῖον, ἁγίον*, the Spirit of Christ, Christ himself by his Spirit; Gal. ii. 20. Hence it is not said from *this* point of view, that the Spirit wishes to do good but is hindered by the flesh from accomplishing its wishes, so that the flesh is the vital principle of action; but it is enjoined on those who have received the divine principle of life, Gal. v. 16, "Walk in the Spirit,* so shall ye not fulfil the desires of the flesh; for the Spirit and the flesh conflict with one another, so that you must distinguish what proceeds from the Spirit and what from the flesh, and you must not fulfil what you desire according to the carnal self,

* I cannot agree with Rückert, in referring the "spirit," *πνεῦμα*, here spoken of, not to the Spirit of God, but to the higher nature of man. Certainly the word *πνεῦμα* in this whole chapter is to be understood only in one sense, and taking everything into account, the idea of the Holy Spirit is the only one which suits Paul's meaning; as, for example, in v. 18. And generally in this epistle, the same idea of the Spirit is to be firmly held. Verse 17 contains no proof to the contrary; for Paul here assumes, that the Spirit has pervaded the distinctive nature of man, that the new principle of life has taken possession of human nature, and given it a new and peculiar vitality. He wishes to mark the new higher principle that is now the antagonist of the "flesh" in man. Men may with the strictest propriety be called upon to surrender themselves to this higher principle, to allow themselves to be led by it, according to its impulses, for Paul considered the operation of the Divine Spirit in man, not as something magical, but constantly assumes the working together of the divine and the human. It is perfectly true that, according to Paul's doctrine, the higher nature in man, the capability of knowing God, which before was confined and depressed, is set at liberty by the Holy Spirit, and now serves as the organ for the operations of the Divine Spirit in human nature, and hence, that as this higher nature of man can now operate in its freedom as the organ of the Divine Spirit, so the latter can now operate in man by means of this organ, and hence the two are blended together in the Christian life. But when Paul wishes to infuse courage and confidence for the spiritual conflict, he directs the attention, not to what is subjectively human, but to the almighty power of God.

but what the Spirit within you desires.”* This marks the contrast to the state described in Rom. vii. 15. Accordingly, the divine life in the inner man must be in continual conflict with the after operations of the flesh, and progressively convert the body, hitherto under the control of sinful habits, into an organ for itself, (Rom. vi. 11–13), so that the “members of the body,” μέλη τοῦ σώματος, become “instruments of righteousness,” ὄπλα δικαιοσύνης; all the powers and faculties which hitherto have been in the service of sin, being appropriated and sanctified by the divine life, are employed as organs of grace for the service of the kingdom of God; and here the doctrine of charisms finds its point of connexion; (*ante*, pp. 136–140). All the peculiar capabilities or talents founded in the nature of each individual, are to be transformed into charisms and employed as such.

And it is the province of Christian Morals to show in what manner human nature must be pervaded in all its powers by the higher principle of life, and appropriated as an organ of its manifestation; how all human relations, set at liberty from the principle of sin which has hitherto prevailed among them and hindered the realization of their design, are to be referred to the kingdom of God in which their design shall be fulfilled; and how what is individual belonging to the representation of the image of God in man is not suppressed and annihilated, but is to be transformed and elevated to a peculiar conformation and manifestation of the higher principle of life, that the one Christ, the Heavenly Man, may give proper form to the diversified peculiarities that serve for his organ.

We here see the difference between Christian principle as Paul represents it, and a one-sided ascetic direction in morals. Paul brings forward as one side in the process of the development of the Christian life, the negative operation, to mortify the principle of sin which has hitherto reigned in the body, Rom. viii. 13, to mortify the members as far as they serve sin, Coloss. iii. 5;† but this is only one side. The other is the pos-

* This passage, in my opinion, cannot be understood otherwise than in this manner, though later expositors have given a different interpretation. It has been supposed to mean, “So that ye cannot accomplish what you desire according to the spirit; ye are unable to follow the dictates of the better will;”—and yet should these words be referred to the state of the regenerate, this would form a singular ground of exhortation for following the leadings of the Spirit, and for withstanding the flesh, if Paul said to them that they were prevented from obeying the good promptings which proceeded from the Spirit by the prevalence of the flesh. But if it is understood of the condition of the natural man, and v. 18 is considered as a contrast, we do not see how Paul, who had before addressed those whom he assumed to be Christians, could make such a sudden transition to a different class of persons. The correspondence of the last words of v. 17, with the last words of the foregoing verse, proves that the “will” here answers to the desires of the flesh, a fleshly will is described by them, just as in the pneumatic or spiritual will, it is no longer the former “I” of the individual, but the man-inspiring Christ, the πνεῦμα that forms the volitional principle.

† The “members which are upon the earth,” μέλη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, which belong to a carnal, earthly course of life, are directly opposed to the heavenly mind in v. 2.

itive operation, the positive appropriation, that as believers are now dead with Christ to sin, the world, and themselves, so now they lead a new divine life, increasingly devoted to him; the Spirit of Christ that dwells in them constantly animates their bodies afresh as his organ, Rom. viii. 11, ff., so that the "members" consecrated to God, are employed in his service, according to the station God has indicated to each individual, as "instruments of righteousness." As the "Holy Spirit," *πνεῦμα ἅγιον*, is the common vital principle of all believers, the animating Spirit of the church of God, so the diversity of the form in which he operates in and through each individual, varied by their sanctified peculiarities and characteristics, is designated by the term charism or gift.

But since this appropriation and pervasion of the old nature is a continual conflict, and the further a man advances in holiness the more capable he is rendered by the illumination of the Holy Spirit of distinguishing what proceeds from the Spirit and what from the flesh, and of discerning all the disturbing influences of the latter, therefore the distinction between objective justification and subjective sanctification is always necessary, in order that the confidence of man may not be wavering, as it must be if he looks only to himself, Philip. iii. 12, but may maintain its firm unchangeable ground, by being fixed on the objective, the grace of redemption, the love of Christ, from which no power of hell can separate the redeemed; Rom. viii. 31, 32. In the Pauline idea of the justification and righteousness available before God, which is granted to man by the redeeming grace of God, and appropriated by faith, the objective is always primary and predominant. At the same time something subjective is imparted with it, something new is deposited in the inner life which must be progressively developed; the righteousness of Christ appropriated by faith, is actually transferred to the inner life of the believer, and becomes a new principle, forming the life according to the example of Christ.* And when this process of development shall be completed, believers will attain to the possession of an eternal, divine, and blessed life, inseparable from perfect righteousness; and then the objective idea of justification will be wholly transferred to the subjective, Rom. v. 19–21; but till this is accomplished, in order, as we have before said, to lay a firm foundation for the confidence of the soul, it is always necessary, while conceiving both ideas according to their essential and ultimate connexion, still to keep in mind their distinction from one another.

Since the whole Christian disposition is produced from faith, and thereby the whole life is determined and formed, the term faith has been employed to designate the whole of the Christian disposition and of Christian ability.† Thus the predicate *δυνατὸς τῇ πίστει*, (strong in faith),

* The scholastic expression, "*Justitia Christi per fidem habet esse in animo*," perfectly corresponds to Paul's meaning.

† Hence the measure of faith as the measure of Christian ability, and the measure of grace bestowed on each individual, are correlative ideas. Rom. xii. 3. Christians are only to aim at rightly applying the measure of ability they have received; to do every-

designates the point of view, where faith in the Redeemer, confidence in the justification obtained through him, has become to such a degree the animating principle of the convictions, and has so pervaded the whole tone of thinking, that a man is enabled to judge and act in all the relations of life according to it, that he cannot be disturbed, as he otherwise would be, by any foreign element of other views which formerly influenced him. The after-workings of the earlier religious convictions no longer exercise over the conscience of such an one any kind of power. This is specially true of the relations of Christianity to Judaism, which, since it, above all other agencies, had furnished a preparatory transition point, could longer than any other exercise its influence over one who from it had attained to faith, so that such a person would only by degrees free himself from its influences on his judgment of all the relations of life; as the new Christian principle proceeding from faith in the Redeemer gradually impregnated his whole mode of thinking. This power of faith over the judgment is shown, for example, in this, that a man, certain of his salvation in fellowship with the Redeemer, will no longer allow himself to be agitated by scruples in the use of outward things, with which he had previously been disturbed in the Jewish religion, as if this or that thing could defile him. So we are to understand what Paul says, Rom. xiv. 2, "one believeth that he may eat all things," *i. e.*, is strong enough in faith to eat all things, *ὃς μὲν πιστεύει φαγεῖν πάντα, i. e. δυνατός ἐστι τῇ πίστει, ὥστε φαγεῖν πάντα*; he can no longer be perplexed by a mixture of scruples arising from his earlier legalism. The being "weak in the faith," *ἀσθενεῖν τῇ πίστει*, forms the opposite to this strength of faith, in which, along with faith, another element arising from the former point of view controlled the convictions, and hence the internal strife between the principle founded in Christian conviction, or *πίστις*, and the doubts that rebelled against it; Rom. xiv. 1. Though Paul took occasion from existing relations to develop his views on this subject with a special reference to the Jewish law, yet they would apply to the relation subsisting between any other point of view and the Christian, or that of the righteousness by faith. The power of faith, governing the life, gives an independence and stability to the Christian character, imparts strength and freedom to the mind. This it is that forms the basis of Christian freedom, which consists in this, that the Christian, since he has devoted his whole life to Christ as his Redeemer, and through him to God, since he is animated only by the consciousness of this dependence and acknowledges no other,—for this reason, feels independent of all created beings, of all earthly things; hence, he acts in the consciousness of this independence, is master of all things by the animating Spirit of Christ, and is in bondage to no man, to no circumstances; nothing can so operate upon him as to determine him to a different

thing according to its proportion; Rom. xii. 6. They are not to indulge conceit, or to pass beyond the limits of their own true position.

course from that dictated by the Spirit of Christ, for this is the great determining principle of his life; 1 Cor. vii. 21, ff.; 1 Cor. vi. 12;* 1 Cor. iii. 22. While the Christian, as an organ of the Spirit of Christ who has won the government of the world, to whom at last all things must be subject, is free from the world and everything belonging to it, from all power of created beings, he likewise in spirit rules over all things. Freedom and mastery over the world here meet. This freedom and this mastery over the world, proceeding from faith (like everything Christian), and grounded in the depths of the soul, can hence manifest themselves under all outward restrictions, and evince their power by the fact that these outward restrictions for the spirit, which is exalted above them and in the consciousness of faith feels itself independent of everything, cease to be restrictive, and are included in his free self-determination and mastery over the world. Paul proves his Christian freedom precisely in this manner, that for the good of others, and in order to make everything subservient to the Spirit of Christ, he so acted in all things as would best contribute to the advancement of the kingdom of Christ, and thus freely submitted to all the forms of dependence. Free from all, he made himself the servant of all; having the mastery over all, he submitted to all the forms of dependence ordained by God, and in doing so, exercised his mastery over the world; 1 Cor. ix. 1-19.

It is evident that nothing can be excepted from this reference of the whole life to the kingdom of God, for the Christian disposition proceeding from faith, and referring everything to God's glory, is the great arbitrator in all the events of life. Accordingly, there can be no empty space for things indifferent of which Christian principle takes no cognisance, nothing belonging to human nature which does not receive a moral impress from Christian principle, as Paul expressly says, "Whether ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God," 1 Cor. x. 31. It may appear to contradict this principle, by which the whole of life becomes one great duty, and no room is left for anything indifferent, that Paul, in 1 Cor. vi. 12, x. 23, distinguishes from the province of the lawful, that which is useful or serves for edification; but the contradiction is only in appearance, and will vanish on a more exact unfolding of the apostle's views. It could only contradict the principle in question, if Paul had reckoned what did not contribute to edification as still belonging to what was lawful on Christian grounds, or if he had not considered what contributed to edifying as what alone was matter of duty. But it was not so, for he declares it to be the *duty* of the Christian in the denial of his selfish inclinations, so to conduct himself as is for the best,

* "I will not be brought under the power of any," οὐκ ἐγὼ ἐξουσιασθήσομαι ὑπὸ τινος, i. e., I will not suffer myself to be mastered by any outward things, but in the spirit of Christian love I will use all things freely. Instead of availing myself of my Christian freedom, I make myself rather a slave of the right, if, in eating the flesh of sacrifices, I believe that I am under obligation to do so in every case, without reference to particular circumstances.

or for the edification of the church, 1 Cor. x. 24; or, which is equivalent, as will be for the glory of God, 1 Cor. x. 31. This is the course of action prescribed by Christian love; but very different would be the course that proceeds from selfishness, and for that reason sinful. The subject will be clearer, if we examine more closely the particular case under the apostle's consideration. He is speaking of partaking of certain kinds of food, more particularly of meat offered to idols. All this belongs to the province of things permitted, and in a religious and moral point of view indifferent, on which Christianity (unlike Judaism) laid no restrictions. "Meat commendeth us not to God; for neither if we eat are we the better; neither if we eat not are we the worse," 1 Cor. viii. 8. "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost," Rom. xiv. 17. But though all this in itself has no moral character, and without the addition of other marks belongs to things indifferent, yet like everything belonging to human nature, it is not excepted from the impression of Christian principle, for it is included in the Pauline maxim, "Whatsoever ye do, whether ye eat or drink, do all to the glory of God;" and Paul himself adduces instances in which what is in itself indifferent may be either a matter of duty or criminal. An individual who, though not sufficiently advanced in Christian knowledge to attain the conviction that the eating of meat sacrificed to idols is in itself indifferent, is yet seduced by worldly considerations to partake of it, acts in a manner deserving of condemnation, since he does not act according to his convictions (*οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως*), Rom. xiv. 23.* And whoever eats of flesh offered to idols, following his own inclination, and taking no account of the scruples of his weak brother, and thus seduces him to follow his example without a firm conviction of its rectitude, troubles his brother's conscience, and himself acts contrary to the law of love, and sins; 1 Cor. viii. 12; Rom. xiv. 15. From this exposition of the apostle's views it appears that, since what every one has to do, under the given conditions and relations under which the Lord has specially placed him, is defined by Christian principles, no one can accomplish more than the measure of his individual duty. Indeed, so much will sinfulness still adhere to all his performances, that even the most advanced Christian will come short of the requirements of duty; as Paul, referring to himself, acknowledges, Phil. iii. 12. Yet what Paul says in reference to his own conduct in one particular instance, may seem to contradict what has just been remarked, 1 Cor. ix. 14, 15, &c. The apostle was authorized in preaching the gospel, to receive his maintenance from the Christian communities for whom he labored; but he waived his claim to it, and supported himself by the labor of his own hands. He did in this, therefore, more than the letter of the general apostolic duty demanded, since he made no use of what was allowable.

* The process of the development of faith, as a principle that vitalizes the whole mind, is, with such an one, not yet so far advanced that he can act from well grounded conviction; thus his conduct is in contradiction to his actual conviction.

But had he made only the letter of that duty his rule of action, without regard to his individual life's work and the peculiar circumstances of his sphere of action, then would he have been obliged to apply to himself the words of Christ in Luke xvii. 10.* Yet he certainly held it to be his duty, under all circumstances, so to act as would most contribute to the advancement of the kingdom of God; and a regard to that object induced him in this instance to receive no maintenance from the church, in order that he might avoid all appearance of self-interest. Hence he felt an inward compulsion to act thus; and if he had not thus acted he would have come in conflict with his individual call, and have been dissatisfied with himself; in fact he had said that he would rather die than act otherwise. The peculiar circumstances of his ministry, and the peculiar charism bestowed upon him, occasioned a peculiar modification of that which was the general duty of all preachers of the gospel. What in his peculiar condition and sphere of labor was a duty, might be contrary to duty in the circumstances of others—those persons, for instance, to whom Providence had committed the maintenance of a family.

The distinctive and fundamental ideas of Christian Morals are in general to be deduced from the nature of faith as a life-determining principle. From faith spontaneously proceeds the love that refers the whole life to God, and consecrates it to his service, for the representation and advancement of his kingdom; for from a knowledge of the love of God manifested in the work of redemption, love is kindled to Him who has shown such superabounding love. In fact, as Paul conceived of faith, love is already contained in it in the germ; for what distinguishes faith in his view from superstition, was that the latter, as it arises only from the dread of sensuous evil, only desires a Redeemer from such evil; faith, on the contrary, develops itself from the feeling of unhappiness in sin as sin, of inward estrangement from God, and of longing after communion with him, which already presupposes the underlying love of God in the heart, though checked and repressed. Faith in the Pauline sense may, indeed, be denominated a conviction determined by an underlying love. But when the revelation of God's holy love in the work of redemption, which faith receives, awakens the slumbering desire of man, or meets it already awakened, the germ of love deposited in the heart is set free from its confinement, that it may expand to communion with its original source. Entering into fellowship with the Redeemer, believers are penetrated by the feeling of God's love to them, and by this method alone can they learn afresh rightly to understand the compass of God's love.† From this perception of God's love, the childlike love of believers is continually inflamed towards him, and this love operates incessantly for

* See Life of Christ, p. 351.

† Rom. v. 5. By the Holy Spirit, the love of God is shed abroad in their hearts and makes itself felt there. The voice of God himself in their hearts declares that they are his children; Rom. viii. 16. Thus, in Eph. iii. 17, there is first the wish that Christ may dwell in their hearts by faith, whereupon it follows, that their inner life may be deeply

the renovation of the whole life after the image of Christ, and for the advancement of the kingdom of God; it forms the life according to the heavenly model presented to it by faith. The whole Christian life appears as the one work of faith, and thus all individual good works* appear as necessary, immediate expressions of faith, its fruits, the signs of the new creation effected by it.† As to the work of faith, everything is to be referred back to the activity of love.‡ Now faith and love have a relation, on one side, to something which is apprehended as present in the inward life; faith in communion with the Redeemer has already received a divine, blessed life; believers are already incorporated with the kingdom of God, and have obtained the right of citizenship in it, and by partaking of the Holy Spirit operating in them by faith, they anticipate the divine power and blessedness of this kingdom; they have the foretaste of eternal life;§ they already possess the germs and first-fruits of the New Creation, in which everything proceeds from a divine principle of life, with which nothing heterogeneous is allowed to mingle—when it attains its completion after the resurrection, Rom. viii. 23. But it follows from this, that the Christian life cannot at all be thought of without a reference to the future; as in the divine life the Future becomes in a certain sense a Present, so the Present exists only in reference to the Future,|| for it contains an anticipation, the germ and preparation of that which will attain to perfect development and completion only in the Future. Into the present earthly system enters a higher, which cannot be fully developed in believers, and the nature of which is not yet wholly manifest, but in many respects is veiled from their view. The process of development of the divine life, which they have appropriated to them-

rooted in the love of God—the love of God towards the redeemed is the element in which their whole inward life and consciousness rest—and having been first penetrated by the feeling of love, they can then rightly understand its compass.

* The “good works,” *ἔργα ἀγαθὰ* are to be distinguished from the “works of the law,” *ἔργα νόμου*.

† The “salvation not of works,” *σωτηρία οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων*, as if men by mere works performed before conversion could earn salvation; for the announcement of the salvation obtained for men by redemption, belongs as a gift of unmerited grace to those who are destitute of the divine life, and thus of the true inclination to goodness, whether they are still sunk in gross sensuality, or are raised to an outward legal morality; and the “good works,” *ἔργα ἀγαθὰ*, which really deserve the name, presuppose that divine life which proceeds from faith; indeed the new creation must manifest itself by corresponding good works; is designed to produce such. Hence the contrast, that believers are not *saved by works*, *σεσωσμένοι ἐξ ἔργων*, but *created unto good works*, *κτισθέντες ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς*, Eph. ii. 9, 10.

‡ Thea. i. 3. *τὸ ἔργον τῆς πίστεως, ὁ κόπος τῆς ἀγάπης*.

§ The Holy Spirit as the *ἀρραβὼν*, in relation to the whole assemblage of heavenly blessings, 2 Cor. i. 22, the “earnest” given as a pledge of the payment of the whole sum.

|| This must be carefully considered, in order rightly to understand the relation of the present to the future in a Christian sense, and to avoid the delusion of the pantheistic deification of self, which imposes on the language of Paul and John a sense quite foreign to the truth.

selves through faith, is now only coming into existence, and is in its feeble beginning. The consciousness of this divine life is accompanied with a consciousness of the obstacles by which that life is surrounded, till human nature is thoroughly pervaded by it and purified from all that is alien; while this consciousness, at the same time, produces a longing after that perfect freedom which is the destiny of the children of God. Though it is always presupposed that believers have already attained the dignity and privileges of the children of God, still their rights relate to something future, for all that is involved in the idea of adoption, all that belongs to the dignity, glory, and blessedness of the children of God, is very far from being realized on earth. With a view to this, it is said in Rom. viii. 23, that Christians who have received the first-fruits of the Spirit, groan after the perfect manifestation of the dignity of the children of God,* after their redemption from all that checks and depresses their inward life. This longing after the other world, is as essential a feature of the Christian life as the partial and fragmentary anticipation of the future in the participation of the divine life through faith. From this point of view Paul utters words which are and must be the greatest offence to that pantheistic deification of the world and self, which in its innermost spirit is thoroughly opposed to Christianity, since from Pantheism consistently carried out there can proceed only a direction of life which is absolutely opposed to that of Christianity: "We should be the most miserable of all men if we had hope in Christ in this life only, with no higher future existence in which our hopes might be fulfilled; for the Christian life would be then a life full of delusive wants that would never be satisfied, a pursuit after unreal phantoms, the offspring of self-deceptive desires." Filled with divine assurance of his convictions and experience, Paul would turn away with abhorrence from views which would make all his conflicts and efforts appear as if devoted to a nonentity.

If the soul, under a sense of the burden which weighs down the higher

* The "adoption," *υιοθεσία*, though, in Gal. iv. 5, this is attributed to believing as something already present. If we compare this passage in the Epistle to the Galatians with that quoted from the Romans, we shall discover a threefold and regularly progressive application of the idea of adoption. At first, Paul, appropriating the term applied to the theocratic nation in the Old Testament, to whom promises were given of an inheritance (the *κληρονομία*) in the kingdom of God, considers this nation as destined to adoption. Those persons to whom the law and the prophets were given, are certainly children and heirs, but they have not yet attained to the actual self-conscious appropriation of the filial relation, and to the exercise of the rights grounded upon it. Since they are in a state of minority, are standing under the guardianship and discipline of the law, and their father's will is not consciously and freely become their own, their relation to him can be no other than that of outward dependence and servitude. But by faith in the Redeemer, and by communion with him as the Son, they become freed from this dependence and servitude, and attain to a self-conscious, mature, and free, filial relation. And this relation in its full extent, includes all that which is founded in the idea of Christ as the Son of God, the perfect communion of his holiness, blessedness, and glory; hence a progressive development of this relationship takes place, until the appearance of the children of God will perfectly correspond to the idea of a child of God; which is the third application of this idea.

life, is absorbed in such longings not confined to one single object, and words fail to express the deeply felt necessities of the heart, these silent aspirations rising from the depths of a heart yearning after true and complete freedom, and yet resigned to the will of its heavenly Father, constitute prayer acceptable to God, inspired by the Spirit of God, the Spirit of adoption. The whole state of such a soul is prayer. The Spirit of God himself intercedes for it with inexpressible and silent groans; Rom. viii. 26. Thus in Coloss. iii. 3, it is said, that as the glory of Christ exalted to the right hand of God is hid from the world, so also the glory of the inner life of believers, proceeding from communion with him, is still hidden with Christ in God, and its appearance does not correspond at present to its nature. But when Christ, the author and source of their life, shall manifest himself in his glory, then shall their hidden glory be manifest, and correspond in appearance to its original; Col. iii. 4.

From this relation of the Christian life of faith and love to a creation that is to be perfectly developed and completed only in the future state, it follows that *Faith* and *Love* cannot subsist without *Hope*.* Faith itself becomes hope, in so far as it apprehends salvation only as something to be realized in the future; Rom. viii. 24.† Faith is proved and strengthened by conflicts and sufferings; by the opposition which it has to overcome, it develops the consciousness of its indwelling divine power, and of those divine results which are not yet apparent, but stretch into eternity; and thus it expands into hope for the future.‡ The consciousness of the love of God contains the pledge for the certain fulfilment of hope. The faith that operates by love could not persist in the efforts which so many obstacles oppose, in conflict with the inward and outward world, if the prospect were not granted of certainly attaining its end. Hence *Perseverance*§ in the work and conflict of faith is the practical side of hope. *Hope*, ἐλπις, and *perseverance* (or “patience,”)

* If we reflect how all the ideas relating to the dignity and blessedness conferred by Christianity refer alike to something Present and something Future, and accordingly admit of various and manifold application, it will be easy to explain why, in Gal. v. 5, “righteousness,” is represented, in reference to its perfect realization in the life of believers, as an object of expectation and hope; and it belongs also to the contrast between the Jewish legalism and Christianity, that with the former it was supposed that “righteousness” might be possessed as something outwardly perceptible and apparent, though the distinction between the idea and the appearance was not thought of.

† If hope be here understood subjectively, it will be placed instead of faith as laying hold of salvation; for faith itself can exist in necessary relation to the future only as hope. But if hope be understood objectively, then it will signify that salvation is here presented as the object of hope, which, on account of the various meanings attached to the word hope, may be taken as the meaning here.

‡ Rom. v. 4. Perseverance under sufferings produces a confirmation (of faith), and confirmation of faith produces hope.

§ On this idea and its relation to the Christian idea of Hope, see Schleiermacher in his *Academical Lecture über die wissenschaftliche Behandlung des Tugendbegriffes*, 1820.

ὑπομονή, appear as associated ideas,* and the latter term is sometimes used instead of hope.†

We must here examine more closely the relation of Knowledge in religion to these three fundamental principles of the Christian life, as laid down in the Pauline theology. Faith presupposes and includes knowledge, for it cannot exist without a reference of the disposition to something objective; there must be an object of knowledge to operate on the disposition.‡ But the divine cannot be known from without, in a merely abstract logical manner, but only from the divine as an element of life in the soul, by the sense for the divine. As long as man is opposed to the divine in the bias of his disposition, he cannot know the divine. Hence Paul says, 1 Cor. ii. 14, the natural man who is estranged from the divine life, receives not what proceeds from the Spirit of God, for it appears to him (precisely on account of this his subjective relation to the divine) as foolishness, and he is unable to know it, because it can be rightly understood and appreciated only in a *spiritual* manner, that is, by means of the Holy Spirit, (πνεῦμα ἁγίου,) so that a participation in this spirit of a higher life is presupposed. Hence, also, we are not to conceive of faith§ as something proceeding from unassisted human nature, from man in his natural state; but the manner in which faith arises in the disposition, presupposes the entrance of the divine into the conscience and inner life. But as the knowledge of divine things depends upon a participation of the divine life, it follows that, in proportion as the divine life received by faith progressively develops, as the contents of faith are vitalized by inward experience, the knowledge of these contents enlarges in a higher degree, and hence this wider expansion of knowledge is described as a fruit of faith.¶ And since the divine life of faith is love, since faith in the Pauline sense cannot be conceived of without love, it is evident that the true knowledge of divine things can only continue to be developed according to the measure of increasing love. Hence Paul says in 1 Cor. viii. 2, that without love there can be only the appearance of knowledge. But as this divine life in the believer is ever subject to disturbing and depressing influences, and exists only in a fragmentary and alloyed state, it follows that the knowledge arising from it will never be otherwise than defective. This may also be inferred from what we have before remarked respecting the relation of faith to the higher order of things still veiled from human sight, with which faith places us in vital communion, and to the nature of that adoption which is at present so imperfectly realized, owing to the opposition between the idea of it and its actual manifestation. Hence Paul makes a contrast between that knowledge which, from the position of the present life, is unequal to the contents of

* 1 Thess. i. 3. ὑπομονή τῆς ἐλπίδος.

† 2 Thess. i. 4.

‡ See p. 419.

§ Ibid.

¶ Coloss. i. 9; Ephes. i. 18. In the last passage, knowledge is represented as an effect of the illumination proceeding from faith.

faith, and that immediate vision which, from the position of the world to come, perfectly corresponds to all that faith contains. He illustrates the relation of the two, by a comparison of the knowledge we possess of objects by seeing them reflected in a dim mirror, with the knowledge obtained by immediate vision; by comparing the notions of children (which contains a certain portion of truth, though not developed with clearness and certainty, so that there is a continuity of knowledge carried on from the child to the man) with the ideas of mature manhood;* by contrasting what is fragmentary and isolated with what is perfect; 1 Cor. xiii. 9-12. Such is the knowledge of divine things as they are shadowed forth to us in our temporal consciousness, compared with the intuition of the things themselves. Hence it is evident, that Paul was conscious that he could speak of these things only in a symbolical form, which veiled and contained a higher reality. Therefore, from the sense of the defectiveness and limitation of our present knowledge of God and of divine things, a longing is excited after that perfect knowledge which the mind of man, allied to its Maker and filled with a divine life, requires. This longing naturally merges into hope.

We are now led to inquire, why Paul, when he represents faith, hope, and love as the abiding, unchangeable foundations of the Christian life in its earthly development,† distinguishes love as the greatest of these

* We may here compare Plato's representation of two kinds of knowledge, at the beginning of the seventh book of his Republic. As if a person were confined in a cavern where the light only feebly glimmered, and he saw merely the shadows of objects by that faint light; and afterwards, regaining his liberty, became acquainted with the objects themselves as they appeared in broad daylight. In this manner Plato contrasts two positions in the present life; the position of the multitude, the slaves of sense, and the position of the higher intellectual life, as it is presented by Philosophy. This higher position of Philosophy might be allowed in the state of the ancient heathen world: but Christianity will allow no such intellectual aristocraticalness. This would become a beautiful image in a Christian sense, if applied, not to the contrast between the degrees of knowledge in this life and those in the future, but to that between the views of the world entertained by the natural man, and those which the divine light of the gospel imparts to all who receive it. We may here compare with Paul's language, the beautiful remarks of Gregory Nazianzen: *Θεὸν δὲ τί ποτε μὲν ἐστὶ τὴν φύσιν καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν, οὔτε τις εὗρεν ἀνθρώπων πώποτε, οὔτε μὴν εὕρη. ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν εὕρήσει ποτὲ, ζητείσθω τοῦτο, Εὕρήσει δὲ ὡς ἐμὸς λόγος, ἐπειδὴν τὸ θεοειδὲς τοῦτο καὶ θεῖον, λέγω δὲ τὸν ἡμέτερον νοῦν τε καὶ λόγον, τῷ οἰκείῳ προσμίξῃ, καὶ ἡ εἰκὼν ἀνέλθῃ πρὸς τὸ ἀρχέτυπον, οὗ νῦν ἔχει τὴν ἐφεσιν, καὶ τοῦτο εἶναι μοι δοκεῖ τὸ πᾶν φιλοσοφούμενον ἐπιγνώσεσθαι ποτε ἡμᾶς, ὅσον ἐγνώσμεθα. Τὸ δὲ νῦν εἶναι βραχεῖά τις ἀποβροῇ πᾶν τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάνον, καὶ οἷον μεγάλου φωτὸς μικρὸν ἀπαύγασμα.—Orat. 34.* (What God is in his nature and essence no man has ever yet discovered, or can discover. But if he will discover, let it be sought. And he shall ascertain it, according to my doctrines, when this godlike and divine—I speak of our understanding and reason—shall mingle with its own, and the image shall ascend to its archetype, for which it has a longing; and this seems to me to be the preëminent aim of philosophy, that we shall sometime know as we are known. The present life, so far as it all relates to us, is a certain emanation, and as it were, a faint reflection of a great light.)

† In reference to understanding this, it makes no difference whether we consider the "now," *νῦν*, in 1 Cor. xiii. 13, as an illative particle or one of time, for in either case, what

three. What is asserted by the Catholics is indeed true, that love alone can give faith its true value, since it makes it living, and hence forms the criterion between dead and living faith.* It is equally true, that love forms the difference between genuine Christian and carnal selfish hope.† But in this connexion Paul could not, according to his own association of ideas, intend to say that love was the greatest, for love in its true Christian meaning presupposes faith (love in a general sense is a different thing; that love which proceeds from the universal sense of God implanted in the human mind, and from the general manifestations of the love of God in the creation and in the heart of a man who follows the divine guidance;) and faith again in a certain manner presupposes love, and that which Paul distinguishes by the name of faith stands in the closest connexion with love, includes it in itself. What the Catholic church understands by the term *fides informis*, Paul would not esteem worthy of being called faith. He calls love the greatest rather for this reason, that it is the only eternal, abiding form of the connexion of the human spirit with the divine; love alone endures beyond this earthly life; it will never give place to the development of a higher principle, but will expand itself in perpetuity.‡

Thus these three fundamental principles of the Christian life, *Faith*, *Hope*, and *Love*, are intimately connected with one another; and since everything which directly or indirectly belongs to man's moral nature is brought under their control, and receives from them a peculiar character, whatever is distinctive in the nature of Christian morals is derived from them.

Paul here says can relate only to the present earthly condition of the Christian life. According to Paul's views, hope necessarily relates to something still future, not yet realized; when the realization takes place, hope ceases to exist; Rom. viii. 24. And faith and the perfect knowledge of immediate intuition are ideas that reciprocally exclude one another; 2 Cor. v. 7. When the late Dr. Billroth in his Commentary on this Epistle, supposes the μένει to refer to the objects of these graces as eternal and abiding, this certainly cannot be Paul's idea, for they are indeed unchangeable, and the same for all the three operations of the Spirit; but these three terms refer to the subjective relation in which man stands to divine things, and this relation under the form of faith and hope, is suited only to the earthly condition, and is itself transitory. Love only is in itself abiding, μένον.

* The *fides informis* and the *fides formata*.

† The "spiritual" (πνευματικῇ), and the "carnal" (σαρκικῇ) as proceeding from a heathenish and from a Jewish element.

‡ Augustin beautifully remarks, in one of his earlier productions: "Fides quare sit necessaria, quum jam videat? Spes nihilominus, quia jam tenet? Caritati vero non solum nihil detrahatur, sed addetur etiam plurimum, nam et illam singularem veramque pulchritudinem quum viderit, plus amabit, et nisi ingenti amore oculum infixerit, nec ab aspiciendo uspiam declinaverit, manere in illa beatissima visione non poterit."—*Soliloquia*, i. § 14. (Why may faith be necessary when it already sees? or hope since it already possesses? But of charity, there shall not only be no diminution but a very great addition; for when one may behold that only and true beauty, he will love the more, and unless he may fix the eye with strong love, nor turn at any time from beholding, can one remain in that most blessed vision?)

Inseparable from these fundamental principles of the Christian life is the idea of *Humility*, ταπεινοφροσύνη. This quality which is closely connected with the whole existence of the theocratic point of view already developed in the Old Testament, as is evident from the ideas conveyed by the terms “afflicted,” “distressed,” humble in spirit,” “a broken and contrite heart,” חַיִּי, חַיִּי, לֵב, חַיִּי, חַיִּי, forms the basis of the contrariety between the Christian, and the ancient view of the world. It serves to mark this contrariety when the word ταπεινὸν or *humile** which in accordance with the ancient view was wont to be employed in a bad sense, is converted in the Christian ethics into a designation of what constitutes the basis of all higher life, and of all true nature. As from the predominance of self-consciousness and self-confidence among the ancients, “humble,” ταπεινὸν, was used to mark a mean, slavish disposition, so on the other hand “greatness of soul,” μεγαλοψυχία,† was used as the symbol of true elevation of soul, a certain pride of self-consciousness, which stands in diametric opposition to the essence of Christian humility. Something bearing an affinity to that ethical idea of revealed religion, is found in a historical reflection of Herodotus, that the self-exaltation of human greatness is punished in history by the judgment of God, who humbles the great and lofty, and exalts the little.‡ Underneath this, however, lies a consciousness of the controversy between God and the creature; a dark opposing force presents itself to the soul, permitting nothing noble to spring up. In order that this undertone of religious feeling should pass over into humility, there must intervene the consciousness of reconciliation with God. What lies at the basis of the view of history taken by Herodotus, appears elevated to an ethical and religious contemplation, when Plato, speaking of the manner in which God reveals himself in history, says, “He is always accompanied by Justice, δίκη, which punishes the deviations from the divine law; and whoever would be happy, let him follow patiently in dependence on the divine justice, humble and orderly.”§ Here ταπεινότης is marked as the disposition, in virtue of which a man submits himself humbly to the Divine laws, in contrast to the pride of the wicked, who, forsaken by God, is visited by punishment. And Plutarch, who perhaps had that passage of Plato in his thoughts, makes a similar use of it, when

* See Knapp's excellent remarks on this opposition in his *Scripta varii Argumenti*, ed. II. p. 367. Aristotle also uses the word to denote a slavish disposition.—Τοὺς μὴ δ' ἐφ' ὅσοις δεῖ κινουμένους τὸν θυμὸν, ἀλλὰ προπηλακίζομένους εὐχερῶς καὶ ταπεινοὺς πρὸς τὰς ὀλιγωρίας.

† Δοκεῖ μεγαλόψυχος εἶναι ὁ μεγάλων αὐτὸν ἀξίων ἄξιος ὢν. Eth. Nicomach. lib. iv. c. 7.

‡ Φιλέει ὁ θεὸς τὰ υπερέχοντα πάντα κολούειν, οὐ γὰρ ἐὰ φρονέειν μέγα ὁ θεὸς ἄλλον ἢ ἑωυτόν. Lib. vii. c. 10, § 5.

§ Τῷ δ' αἰὲν ξυνέπεται δίκη τῶν ἀπολειπομένων τοῦ θείου νόμου τιμωρός. Ὡς ὁ μὲν εὐδαιμονήσειν μέλλων ἐχόμενος ξυνέπεται ταπεινὸς καὶ κεκοσμημένος. De Legib. lib. iv. ed. Bipont. vol. viii. p. 185.

he says that "wickedness, when checked by punishment, can scarcely be made considerate, humble, and God-fearing."* Yet in both passages we have not the whole idea of humility, but only a part of it—humility in reference to God as a judge.

But the Christian idea of humility comprehends the full consciousness of dependence on God as the animating principle of life in all its relations, the consciousness of the innate weakness of all created beings, the consciousness of inability to be or to do anything except through God, and the disposition which is founded in the consciousness of all this. But from the legal point of view, this consciousness was either only partial, inasmuch as self-righteousness (which implied a desire of independence in reference to moral development and the attainment of salvation) counteracted the perfect acknowledgment of dependence on God; or, where the feeling of internal disunion had been developed to its utmost extent, and the feeling of estrangement from a holy Omnipotence became predominant, only the negative element of humility remained, the consciousness of personal worthlessness as something mortifying to pride, the consciousness of an impassable chasm between the limited sinful creature and the Almighty, Holy Creator. But when to this feeling is added faith in the Redeemer, and the consciousness of having obtained redemption, the positive is blended with the negative element; there arises the consciousness of participation in the divine life and in the high dignity of adoption bestowed by God. If, on the contrary, that connexion between these two points, which belongs to the essence of Christian knowledge and of the Christian disposition, be dissolved, and the negative element be unduly brought forward, a false self-humiliation is produced,—a self-renunciation with a denial of the dignity founded on the consciousness of redemption,—a sense of depression without that sense of exaltation which is blended with it in the consciousness of redemption. Such a false humility, which displays itself in outward gestures and ceremonies, Paul combated in the false teachers of the Colossian church; but he classed this mock-humility with spiritual pride, veiled as it was under the form of an ascetic self-abasement.†

* Ἀνακρουομένη τῷ κολάζεσθαι κακία μόλις ἂν γένοιτο σύννους καὶ ταπεινὴ καὶ κατὰ φόβος πρὸς τὸν θεόν. De Sera Numinis Vindicta, c. 3.

† This is a caricature of humility, which has often reappeared in the history of the church; and thus the nature of genuine Christian humility has been frequently mistaken by those who were strangers to the true Christian spirit, and knew not how to distinguish a morbid from a healthy state of the spiritual life. An individual of this class, Spinoza, justly says of that mock-humility, which alone can exist where the natural feelings are not overpowered by the force of a divine principle of life, and at the same time transformed into something higher, and where man has not risen from the depths of self-abasement to a nobler condition: "Hi affectus, nempe humilitas et abjectio, rarissimi sunt. Nam natura humana, in se considerata, contra eosdem, quantum potest, nititur, et ideo, qui maxime creduntur abjecti et humiles esse, maxime plerumque ambitiosi et invidi sunt." (These qualities, namely, humility and lowliness, are of the rarest. For human nature, in itself considered, resists them with all its force, and hence those believed to be

With the consciousness of the nothingness of all that man can be and effect by his own power, Paul combined the elevating consciousness of what man is and can perform through the Lord; to the phrases, *as pertaining to the flesh, glorying in man*, κατὰ σάρκα, ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ καυχᾶσθαι he opposes the *glorying in the Lord*, ἐν κυρίῳ καυχᾶσθαι. As humility first acquires its true character through the love that proceeds from faith, as through love man's whole life is pervaded by a sense of his dependence on God, and the human will becomes an organ of the divine, so also Christian love cannot exist without an abiding consciousness of the difference between the creature and the Creator, the redeemed and the Redeemer, and the sense of dependence which that difference involves. It is this consciousness which Paul thus expresses: "What hast thou, which thou hast not received?" 1 Cor. iv. 7. It was this consciousness which animated him in the exercise of his ministry, a consciousness of his weakness as a man,* which was deepened by his sufferings and conflicts, though accompanied by the conviction that he could do all things required of him, through the power of the Lord; Acts xx. 19. Thus that state of mind is produced which he describes as "with fear and trembling," μετὰ φόβον καὶ τρομόν. This is far from being the mark of a slavish fear, but only of that state of mind which proceeds from a sense of the insufficiency of everything human in the momentous duties of a divine call.†

Humility bears an immediate relation to God alone, and, according to the Pauline views, can have reference to no other object. Every reference to man and the creation generally, is strictly excluded; for in humility there is a consciousness of the dependence of the creation as such on the Creator, inclusive of the whole assemblage of created beings. It follows, that a man who is thoroughly imbued with this sentiment does not make any fellow-creature the object of it, but as far as his spiritual life is concerned, is perfectly independent of men, while sensible of his continual dependence on God. To act differently would be to transfer to a creature the honor due to the Creator. As it is opposed to every slavish feeling, it inspires the soul with that true Christian freedom‡ which Paul so admirably develops in the First Epistle to the Corinthians as opposed to every species of a slavish deference to men. But though humility in and of itself does not directly affect our behavior to our fellow-men, there yet flows from it the right determination of Christian conduct towards others. He who is rightly penetrated with the feelings of dependence on

specially lowly and humble are oftentimes specially ambitious and envious.)—*Ethics*, pars iii. § 29.

* See p. 171.

† Thus in Philip. ii. 12, he deduces "working out salvation with fear and trembling," from the consciousness that all things depend on the power of God, who works "to will and to do."

‡ See page 432.

God in reference to his whole existence and conduct, and with the nothingness of everything human while living only for one's self, will not pride himself in his abilities, but feel that they are bestowed upon him by God for a definite object, and must be used in dependence on him; in his intercourse with others, he will bear in mind the defects, the limits, and the imperfection of his own character and abilities, and the dependence of himself, as well as of all other men, on their common Lord. From this humility will naturally arise an aversion from every kind of self-exaltation in a man's conduct towards others, and that which in the constitution of the Christian character is the foundation of modesty, and hence is distinguished by no particular name in Paul's writings, is related to the idea of humility and derived from it, as in Phil. ii. 3. And it is not without reason that gentleness, meekness, and long-suffering are mentioned in connection with humility. Eph. iv. 2; Col. iii. 12.

In order to preserve the purity of the divine life in its conflict with the world and the flesh, from within and from without, to prevent unhappy mixtures of the human with the divine, the *σωφροσύνη*, the *σωφρονεῖν* is requisite, the self-government and conquest over the world that proceeds from love, or Christian circumspection and sober-mindedness. The Holy Spirit is represented as a spirit of "love," *ἀγάπη* and of "a sound mind," *σωφρονισμός*, 2 Tim. i. 7.* The latter word, as its etymology imports, signifies that quality by which the Christian life is preserved in a healthy state, and kept free from all noxious influences. Humility, which guards the boundary between the divine and the human, is accompanied by the "thinking soberly," *φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν*, which acts as an antidote to the intoxication of self-esteem, and promotes a sober valuation of one's own worth, the remembrance of the measure of ability and gifts granted to each one, as well as the special position allotted to each, and so protects against arrogating too much to one's self; Rom. xii. 3. With this is connected the *watching and being sober*, *ἐγρηγορέναι καὶ νήφειν*, by means of which the sensual and the natural are prevented from interfering with the movements of the divine life, and the mind is kept clear of all enthusiastic tendencies. Moreover, since faith working by love ought to govern the whole life, animate it with a new spirit, and form it for the service of God, it will be requisite for this end, that the reason, enlightened by this spirit, should acquire the capability of so regulating the whole life, of so managing and applying all the relations of social and civil life, as will be suited to realize the design of the kingdom of God, according to the place assigned to each individual by Providence. This is expressed by the term *σοφία*,† which comprehends the ideas of

* Titus, ii. 6, 12. *σωφρονεῖν* here means the exercise of a control over youthful and worldly lusts.

† Also in Plato (see the *Republic*, iv.) wisdom, *σοφία*, takes the rank elsewhere assigned to prudence, *φρόνησις*, among the cardinal virtues. Aristotle (in the *Greater Ethics*, i. 35) makes a distinction thus: wisdom relates to the eternal and the divine; prudence to what is useful to man. *Ἡ μὲν σοφία περὶ τὸ αἰδίου καὶ τὸ θεῖον, ἡ δὲ φρόνησις περὶ τὸ συμφέρον*

wisdom and prudence,* of which the first relates to the choice of proper objects of pursuit, and the second to the choice of suitable means for their attainment; and both are blended in one idea, when everything is employed as means for the all-comprehensive object of life, the realization of the kingdom of God,† and when Christian wisdom is conceived of as so shaping and controlling the life, that it may contribute as a whole and in all its subordinate relations to the advancement of the divine kingdom, according to the position of each individual; and thus what is in itself an object, becomes a means to the highest object. Christian prudence, which emanates from the clear undisturbed survey of a wisdom that controls the whole life, is to be clearly distinguished from that which is not founded on such a basis, but would proudly assume a separate standing as capable of regulating the conduct independently of Christian wisdom—the prudence which subserves a selfish interest, or employs means which a Christian mind cannot approve, or one which places more confidence in human means than in the power and guidance of the Divine Spirit, the “fleshly wisdom,” σοφία σαρκική, which, as such, is opposed to the simplicity and purity of the disposition produced by the Spirit of God; 2 Cor. i. 12. Paul requires the union of a matured understanding and a childlike disposition, a childlike innocence, 1 Cor. xiv. 20. “In malice be ye children, in understanding be ye men,” even as Christ enjoined his disciples to unite the wisdom of the serpent and the harmlessness of the dove.

Thus, in the renovation of human nature by the divine principle of life—in the quickening of the whole life by the principle of believing and hoping love, we find the three fundamental virtues, which were regarded by the ancients in the development of morals as forming the grand outlines of moral character. *Perseverance*, ὑπομονή, corresponds to *manliness*, ἀνδρεία, which last term includes both *courage* in action (the “quit you like men,” “be strong,” ἀνδρίζεσθαι, κραταιοῦσθαι, 1 Cor. xvi. 13,) and *patience*, μακροθυμία, under sufferings for the kingdom of

ἄνθρωπον. This corresponds to the manner in which Aristotle marks off the department of ethics, the contrast made by him between the divine and the purely human. But such contrast is not in accordance with the Christian teachings, which demand that everything human should be referred to the eternal and the divine, and the “useful to man,” συμφέρον ἄνθρωπον, is grounded on this. The true prudence, which includes wisdom, is that which from the eternal and the divine gives the direction to the whole life, and forms its plan accordingly.

* To σοφία is attributed the “walking circumspectly,” ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖν, careful examination relative to one’s conduct in social life, that a man may discern on every occasion what is agreeable to the will of the Lord, and, under difficult circumstances, may choose the right opportunity for accomplishing what is good, the “redeeming the time,” ἐξαγοράζεσθαι τὸν καιρὸν, Eph. v. 15. Σοφία would be shown in the intercourse of Christians with heathens, in avoiding whatever would give them offence, and so regulating the conduct according to circumstances, as would be best fitted to overcome their prejudices against Christianity, and recommend it to their regard.

† From this point of view Christ represents all Christian virtues under the form of prudence. See Life of Christ, 273–77.

God ;—(this latter idea, from its connexion with the Christian views of total dependence on God, and of the imitation of the sufferings of Christ, who by his sufferings conquered the kingdom of evil, stands out in more direct contrast to the principles of ancient heathenism.) *Wisdom, σοφία* corresponds to *prudence, οφρόνησις*, and *moderation, σωφροσύνη*. Of the ancient cardinal virtues then, there remains only *righteousness, δικαιοσύνη*; yet what is generally intended by Paul under this name, does not naturally belong to this place, since it bears no correspondence to the more restricted sense of righteousness, but, according to the Hellenist phraseology, is put for the whole of moral perfection founded in piety. But the prominence given to the idea of righteousness by the ancients is closely connected with that which essentially distinguishes their moral development from that of Christianity, namely, their practice of considering civil life as the highest form of human development which includes all others in it, and the State as the condition adapted for the complete realization of the highest good.* As now by realizing the idea of a kingdom of God, morality was freed from this limitation, was exalted and widened in its application to all mankind, became transformed into a divine life in human form ; and as it is the *Love of God* which manifests itself as the holy and redeeming characteristic of this kingdom, it follows that, in the divine life of this kingdom, love occupies the place that in the view of antiquity was held by righteousness, so that, as Aristotle and Plato traced back all the cardinal virtues to the idea of righteousness, and according to the Grecian proverb, righteousness included in itself all other virtues ;† so according to Paul, love is the fulfilling of the law, includes and originates all other virtues, and is, in short, the sum and substance of perfection.‡ And in 1 Cor. xiii. 4, 5, he represents all the peculiar acts of the leading Christian virtues as so many modes of love.§ Love is discreet, patient, persevering, always chooses what is becoming, is all things to all men, and thus shows itself to be true prudence. The idea of righteousness is not excluded, for all the acts of love may be conceived as determined by a regard to right ; for love is not capricious but conformable to law ; it acknowledges and respects those human relations which are agreeable to the will of God, and gives to every one what his position in society demands. In Rom. xiii. 7, Coloss. iv. 1, love is certainly to be regarded as the animating principle in the performance of the “just and equal,” *δίκαιον καὶ ἴσον*, which may therefore be considered as only one mode of the operation of love.

Since Paul considered faith as the fundamental principle of the Christian life, it follows, that the immediate relation of each individual to the Redeemer was in his view of primary importance, and the idea of fellow-

* The opinion of those who attribute to the *State* such an importance, and would regard it as the perfect, final form for the realization of the kingdom of God, is derived from unchristian premises, and leads to anti-Christian conclusions.

† ἐν δὲ δικαιοσύνῃ συλλήβδην πᾶς ἀρετὴ ἐνι. Aristot. Eth. Nicomach. lib. v. c. 3.

‡ σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος. Coloss. iii. 14. § As Aug.: affectus quosdam amoris

ship, the idea of the Church, was deducible from it. Through faith each one entered for himself into fellowship with the Redeemer, partook of the Holy Spirit as the new principle of life, and became a child of God, a temple of the Holy Spirit. The knowledge of God has been rendered attainable to all through Christ, for in him God has manifested himself in the most complete and to the human mind the only conceivable manner, has communicated himself to our race through Christ, the founder of reconciliation, the author of a new filial relation of man to God. Through his mediation the whole Christian life becomes acceptable to God, by a reference to him who is always the sole worthy object of the divine good pleasure, and from whom that good pleasure is extended to all who enter into spiritual fellowship with him. To this mediation, which is always presupposed as a matter of Christian consciousness, to this production of the whole Christian life through consciousness of redemption received from Christ, relate the Pauline expressions, "*God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*"—"doing all in the name of Christ to the glory of God"—"giving thanks to God through Christ"—"praying to God"—"all things in Christ"—"in the name of Christ"—"through Christ"—the prepositions in which phrases can be deprived of their strict meaning only by an utter misconception of the Pauline connexion of ideas. Although the high priesthood of Christ, and the universal priesthood of all believers, are expressions not found in Paul's writings, yet from what has been said, the ideas implied in them lie at the very foundation of his religious conceptions. Thus with Paul there is, unquestionably, an immediate reference of religious knowledge and experience to Christ as the only fountain-head, from whom everything else is derived. Hence, he could treat of the nature of Christian faith in the eleven first chapters of the Epistle to the Romans, without introducing the idea of the Church. But the consciousness of divine life received from Christ, is necessarily followed by the recognition of a communion which embraces all mankind, and passes beyond the boundaries of earthly existence, the consciousness of the Holy Spirit as the Spirit producing and animating this communion—the consciousness of the unity of the divine life shared by all believers, a unity which counterbalances all the other differences existing among mankind, as had been already manifested at the first promulgation of Christianity, when the most marked contrarieties arising either from religion, national peculiarities, or mental culture, were reconciled, and the persons whom they had kept at a distance from each other became united in vital communion. To the extraordinary influence of Christianity in relation to these contrarieties, Paul bears witness when he says, "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." There was in this respect no difference whether a member of the Church was Jew or Greek (in his descent or in his former religion), slave or freeman, male or female, for all were in communion with Christ as one

person, there was in all the one life of Christ, Gal. iii. 26–28.* The consciousness of communion with the Redeemer cannot exist without the recognition of the existence of the community of believers animated by one Spirit, who belong as his body to him the head, under whose continued influence alone it can grow to maturity, and in which all believers are members one of another. The body of Christ is *the Church*, the *ἐκκλησία θεοῦ* or *Χριστοῦ*.† This communion is formed and developed on the same foundation as the Christian life or the temple of God in each individual, namely faith in Jesus as the Redeemer, 1 Cor. iii. 11. Hence the image so frequently used by Paul to represent the church as a building which is gradually reared on this foundation, Ephes. ii. 20; and his application of the term “to build,” “to edify,” *οικοδομεῖν*, to designate whatever contributes to the furtherance of Christian life. The principle from which this communion springs, always continues to be the bond of its union. Paul, in treating of this unity, adduces as plain marks of its origin from within, (Ephes. iv. 4,) the one spirit which animates this one body, the one object of heavenly blessedness to which all are called, the one faith in one God, whom through Christ they have acknowledged as the Father of all, with whom through Christ and the Spirit imparted by him, they are connected most intimately, so that he rules over them with his all-guiding, all-protecting might, pervades them all with his efficacious power, and dwells in all by his animating Spirit—and the one Redeemer, whom they all acknowledge as their Lord, and to whom they were dedicated by baptism.‡ The consecrated people, under the Old Testament form of the Theocracy, constituted a contrast to the heathen nations, which was now transferred with a more spiritual and internal character to the community of believers. They retained the predicates *ἅγιοι* and *ἡγιασμένοι*, the holy, consecrated people, in reference to the objective consecration founded on redemption, and their objective contrariety to the profane, the “world,” *κόσμος*; but yet the subjective

* In Coloss. iii. 11, Paul notices particularly the contrast between the civilized and uncivilized, the Greek being the most striking example of the former class, and the Scythian of the latter. In his language lies a prophetic intimation that Christianity would reach the rudest tribes, and impart a new divine principle of life, the mainspring of all sound mental culture.

† This certainly is no abstract representation, but a truly living reality. If in all the widely-spread Christian communities, amidst all the diversity of human peculiarities animated by the same spirit, only the consciousness of this higher unity and communion were retained, as Paul desired, this would be the most glorious appearance of the one Christian church, in which the kingdom of God represents itself on earth; and no outward constitution, no system of episcopacy, no council, still less any organization by the State, which would substitute something foreign to its nature, could render the idea of a Christian church more real or concrete.

‡ We cannot suppose that the “one baptism,” *ἐν βάπτισμα*, refers to unity in the outward institution of baptism, which would be here quite irrelevant. All the marks of unity here mentioned manifestly relate to the same thing, to which the unity of faith also relates.

consecration arising from the development of the divine principle of life, was necessarily founded on the former, and inseparable from it—even as justification and sanctification are connected with one another. They retained also the predicate “called,” *κλητοὶ*, as those who were called by the grace of God to a participation of the kingdom of God and eternal happiness; and this calling is not to be considered merely as outward, by virtue of the external publication of the gospel, but agreeably to its design, and as the very idea imports, the external is to be thought of in connexion with the internal, the outward publication of the gospel with the efficacious inward call of the Divine Spirit, so that hence the idea of *κλητοὶ* coincides with that of believers who really belong in heart to Christ. In general, Paul considers the outward and the inward, the idea and the appearance, in all these relations, as intimately connected, the confession as an expression of faith, 1 Cor. xii. 3, the being in Christ as a reality, the being a professed Christian as a sign of inward communion with the Redeemer, 2 Cor. v. 17; and thus also the Church as the outward exhibition of the body of Christ, the fellowship truly established by the Spirit of God. The language in which he addresses individual churches is conformable to these views. When Paul proceeds from this agreement of the inward and the outward, and regards that which appears outwardly as one with the divine reality which should be expressed in it, we must never forget how emphatically he opposes every kind of externalising of religion, which he looked upon as something belonging to the Jewish stand-point—how he represents the divine life as developed in every individual from within, through the faith that refers immediately to Christ himself. Gal. iii. 5.

But though in general the apostle sets out from this point of view, yet it could not escape his observation that not all who outwardly represented themselves as members of the church, were really in the true sense members of the body of Christ. This distinction he does not make in the original idea of the church, since it is not naturally deducible from it, but must be considered as something incongruous and morbid, and not to be known excepting by observation, unless we refer it to the directly inevitable disorders that in the development of the visible church arise from the reaction of sin. Certain experiences of this kind forced the distinction upon him; in 1 Cor. vi. 9, he declares that those who professed Christianity outwardly, and represented themselves as members of the church, but whose conduct was at variance with the requirements of Christianity, could have no part in the kingdom of God. It followed, therefore, that they were already, on earth, excluded by their disposition from that kingdom, from that communion of the faithful and redeemed which, strictly speaking, constitutes the Church. In this passage, he treats of cases in which the foreign elements which had mingled with the outward manifestation of the church, might be easily detected and expelled by the judgment of the Christian community for the preservation of its purity; for such marks of an unchristian course of life are here mentioned, as are notorious and ap-

parent to every one. But an unchristian disposition, a deficiency of faith working by love, might exist, without being manifested by outward signs which would be as easily understood as in the former case; and here the separation of the elements that corresponded to the idea of the church from those that were incongruous, could not be so accurately made. We learn this from Paul himself, in 2 Tim. ii. 19, 20, where he contrasts with the apostates from Christian truth, those who constituted the firm foundation of God's house, and who wore the impress of this seal, "The Lord knoweth them that are his," and "Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity." "In a great house there are not only vessels of gold and vessels of silver, but also of wood and of earth; and some to honor, and some to dishonor. The great house is here the visible Church; in it are those who are members only in appearance by an external superficial union, without really belonging to it by their disposition, and who, on account of their connexion with it reckoned by the Lord to be his, "the vessels to dishonor," are to be distinguished from those who, united in heart to the church, "the vessels to honor," in order that they may be preserved as such, avoid all sin, and call on the name of the Lord without hypocrisy. He here intimates that the line of distinction between the genuine and the spurious members of the church, can be drawn only by God who knows the hidden disposition. Accordingly, in the application of the idea of the visible church, the distinction arises between the collective body of those in whom the appearance corresponds to what is internal and invisible, and those who belong to the church in appearance, without having internally any part in it.

Since the Church, as the body of Christ not merely lays claim to a part of the life of its members, but must embrace the whole as belonging to the Redeemer, and as animated by the Holy Spirit, the source of life to the church, it follows that the care for the promotion of the good of the whole is committed not merely to certain officers and persons, but all the members are bound together as organs of that Spirit by whom Christ, as the governing Head, animates each individual member, and thus mutually united, are to coöperate for the same object; Eph. iv. 16. Thus, accordingly, it is the duty of each one to consider the position in which God has placed him by his natural character, his peculiar training, and his social relations, as that which determines the mode in which he may most effectually labor for this end. As all natural abilities are to be consecrated as forms of manifestation for the divine life, so the Holy Spirit, while animating the whole, appropriates each individual character, and gives to each one his special gifts by which he is ordained to promote the general good, according to his endowments and opportunities. Here we have the idea of charism, which has been already explained.* Without the Holy Spirit and the charisms as the necessary manifestations and signs of his continued efficacious presence in the collective body

* See page 430.

of believers, the Church (which is the continued revelation of the divine life in human form proceeding from the glorified Saviour) cannot exist; 1 Cor. xii. By the spirit of love animating the whole, the charisms of all the individual members, forming reciprocal complements to each other, are conducted to the promotion of one object, the perfecting of the whole body of Christ; as Paul has so admirably represented in 1 Cor. xii.

Since the Church is no other than the outward visible representation of the inward communion of believers with the Redeemer and with one another, answering to this twofold element of the fellowship, both in respect to its inward nature and its outward manifestation, the ordinances of Baptism and the Supper were instituted as outward visible signs to represent as actually existing the facts in which the essence of this fellowship rests. Baptism denotes the confession of dependence on Christ and the entrance into communion with him; and hence, the appropriation of all which Christ promises to those who stand in such a relation to him; it is the *putting on Christ*, in whose name baptism is administered,* an expression which includes in it all we have said; Gal. iii. 27.† As communion with Christ and the whole Christian life has a special reference to the appropriation of those two great events, his redeeming sufferings and his resurrection,‡ Paul, alluding to the form in which baptism was then administered, and by this illustrating the idea of baptism, explains the outward act by a reference to these two events.§ The twofold relation of man to the former views of life which he had renounced, and to those new ones which he had embraced, is here signified—entering into fellowship with the death of Christ, into a believing appropriation of the work of redemption accomplished by his death, dying with him in spirit to the world in which one has hitherto lived; mortifying self, as it heretofore existed, and by faith in his resurrection as a pledge of resurrection to an eternal divine life in a transformed personality, rising to a new life devoted no longer to the world but to him alone; Rom. vi. 4. In accordance with this train of thought, Paul terms baptism, a baptism into the death of Christ. And for the same reason, he could also call it a baptism into the resurrection of Christ. But this latter reference presupposes the former; the latter, in fact, includes the former. From communion with Christ as the Son of God, the new relation follows of sonship to God, of filial communion with God, Gal. iii. 26; and the participation in the spirit of a new divine life in the Holy Spirit communicated by Christ. It is Christ who imparts the true baptism of the Spirit, of which water-baptism is only the symbol, and this

* On the meaning of the formula, "to baptize in the name of any one," see the remarks of Dr. Bindseil in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1832, part ii.

† Paul in Gal. iii. 27, might have said, "All of you who have believed in Christ." But he said instead of this, "as many of you as have been baptized into Christ," since he viewed baptism as the objective sign and seal of the relation to Christ into which man entered by faith.

‡ See page 421.

§ Page 160.

immersion in the Spirit makes precisely the difference between Christian baptism and that of John. Therefore, baptism in the name of Christ is at the same time, necessarily, baptism in the name of the Father and of the Holy Spirit. The one reference cannot be thought of without the three-fold. In virtue of the connexion of ideas before noticed, entrance into communion with Christ is indissolubly connected with entrance into communion with the body of which He is the head, the whole assemblage of believers. "By one Spirit we are all baptized into one body, hence are incorporated with it through baptism;" 1 Cor. xii. 13. As entrance into communion with the Redeemer at baptism implies a cessation from communion with sin—the putting on of Christ implies the putting off of the old man—the rising with Christ implies the dying with Christ—the transformation by the new Spirit of holiness implies the forgiveness of sins and the cleansing from sin—entrance into communion with the body of Christ implies a departure from communion with a sinful world; so the distinction arises of a positive and a negative significance in baptism. Hence the washing away of sin, sanctification and justification, are classed together at baptism; 1 Cor. vi. 11.* What we have remarked respecting Paul's idea of the church, the relation of the inward to the outward, the ideal to the visible, will also apply to baptism. As Paul, in speaking of the church, presupposes that the outward church is the visible community of the redeemed; so he speaks of baptism on the supposition that it corresponded to its idea, that all that was inward, whatever belonged to the holy rite and its complete observance, accompanied the outward; hence he could assert of outward baptism whatever was involved in a believing appropriation of the divine facts which it symbolized; whatever must be realized when baptism fully corresponds to its original design. Thus he says, that all those who had been baptized into Christ, had entered into vital communion with him, Gal. iii. 27; language which was applicable only to those in whom the inward and the outward harmonised as the idea of baptism required. Hence also he calls baptism the bath of regeneration and of renewal by the Holy Spirit; Tit. iii. 5. And hence he says, that Christ by baptism has purified the whole church as a preparation for that perfect purity which it will exhibit, in that perfection to which the Saviour would exalt it; Eph. v. 26. And yet, according to what has been said above, it is certain that Paul derives everything from faith. If any one had wished to attribute to the power of an outward, sensible ceremony,—an element belonging to the senses,—what is to be deduced from an internal appropriation through faith, Paul would have applied to baptism what he said of circumcision, that it was a return to the element of the world, a putting the "carnal,"

* As Paul here joins the "in the name of the Lord," *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου*, and "by the Spirit of God," *ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ θεοῦ*, it may be inferred that he is here speaking of subjective sanctification, by the communication of a divine principle of life, as well as of objective justification.

σαρκικόν, in the place of the "spiritual," πνευματικόν. But he speaks, in the passages we have quoted, of the whole of the Divine transaction in which faith is included, as the subjective element from which everything proceeds. And it is a common figure of speech, to state one principal element for the sum total of elements; in this instance, the most outward is adduced, by which the whole is brought under observation, the closing point of the whole, which presupposes all the other elements, including the most internal.

Relative to the Holy Supper, it appears from Paul's language in 1 Cor. xi. 24, that he considered it a feast in commemoration of Christ's offering his life* for the salvation of men, and of all the benefits accruing thereby to mankind. According to his explanation of the words of the institution, 1 Cor. xi. 26, believers, when they unitedly celebrate the Last Supper of Christ with his disciples, are gratefully to proclaim what they owe to the sufferings of Christ till his second coming, till they are favored with the visible presence of the Saviour, and the perfect enjoyment of all that his redeeming sufferings have gained for mankind. Hence believers, in united praise to the Lord to whose redeeming sufferings they owe their salvation, should celebrate the Supper as a pledge of their constant communion with him, till that communion is consummated in his immediate presence. Christ further designed, as Paul teaches, to remind his disciples of the new relation or covenant established by his sacrifice between God and man, which is naturally connected with what has been already mentioned; for as the work of redemption accomplished by Christ's sufferings is the foundation of this new relation, which supersedes the ancient legal economy, its connexion with the institution of this ordinance is self-evident. And as in the institution of the Supper there are several allusions to the usages practised at the passover, a natural point of comparison is here presented between the establishment of the earthly national Theocracy, which was accomplished by the release of the Jews from earthly bondage and their formation into an independent, national communion,—and the establishment of an universal Theocracy in a spiritual form, which consisted in releasing its members from the spiritual bondage of sin, and their formation into an internally independent community or church of God. If this subject is viewed in the Pauline spirit, it will be evident, that all this can be properly fulfilled only in vital communion with the Redeemer, apart from which nothing in the Christian life has its proper significance; and that there can be no real commemoration of Christ's redeeming sufferings except in vital communion with him. The solemn remembrance of Christ's sufferings is the leading idea in this holy ordinance, though the consciousness of communion with him

* That this was the leading reference, I agree with what Lücke has stated in his *Essay, De duplici in sacra Cœna Symboli Actusque Sensu ac Ratione*, 1837. Yet other references appear to me not to be excluded, but to be originally given with it, and to be naturally connected with it and founded on it.

is necessarily connected with it. And communion with Christ necessarily presupposes his redeeming sufferings, and the personal appropriation of these. Baptism, as baptism into the death of Christ, also introduces believers into his communion. In Baptism they *put on Christ*, just as in the Supper they eat his flesh and drink his blood.

With respect to the manner in which Paul conceived of the relation of the outward signs to the body and blood of Christ, we must not forget that the latter are here considered merely as having been given for the salvation of mankind. Under this view the form in which he quotes Christ's words is important. He says, "This cup is the 'new covenant,' *καινή διαθήκη*, which was established by the shedding of my blood." This can only mean: The cup represents to you in a sensible manner the institution of this new relation. And by analogy the first "this is," *τοῦτό ἐστι*, must be interpreted: "It represents my body."* True, he immediately afterwards says that whoever eats or drinks in an unworthy manner, that is, with a profane disposition, uninterested in or not recollecting the design of the holy ordinance, so that, as Paul himself explains it in v. 29, he does not distinguish what is intended to represent the body of Christ from common food—that such a one sins against the body and blood of the Lord. But from these words we cannot determine the relation in which the bread and wine were considered by Paul to stand to the body and blood of Christ, for the sinning of which he speaks, as the connexion shows, consists only in the relation of the communicant's disposition to the holy design of the ordinance. On the supposition that only a symbolically religious meaning was attached to the Supper, this language might be used respecting those who partook of it merely as a common meal. And what he afterwards says, that whoever partook of the Supper unworthily, partook of it to his condemnation, is by no means decisive, for this relates only to the religious consciousness of the individual. Whoever partook of the Lord's Supper with a profane disposition, without being penetrated with a sense of the holy significance of the rite, by such vain conduct passed the sentence of his own condemnation, and exposed himself to punishment. Accordingly, in the evils which at that time affected the church, the apostle beheld the marks of divine punishment.

* Those who advocate the metaphorical interpretation of the expressions used in the institution of the Supper, are very unjustly charged with doing violence to the words, by departing from the literal meaning. If the literal interpretation of the circumstances and relations under which anything is said, be contrary to the connexion and design of the discourse, this literal interpretation is unnatural and forced. And this is certainly the case in the interpretation of these words of our Lord, for since Christ was still sensibly present among his disciples when he said that this bread was his body, this wine was his blood, they could understand him as speaking only symbolically, if he added no further explanation. Moreover, they were accustomed to similar symbolical expressions in their intercourse with him; and this very symbol receives its natural interpretation from another of Christ's discourses, see the chapter on John's doctrine; also *Life of Christ*, p. 390; and *Lücke's Essay* referred to above.

In the 10th chapter of the same Epistle, the apostle speaks of the Lord's Supper, and declares to the Corinthians that it was unlawful to unite a participation in the heathen sacrifices with Christian communion in the Holy Supper. He points out that, by participating in the heathen sacrifices, they would relapse into fellowship with idolatry. These sacrifices bore the same relation to the heathen religious fellowship as the Jewish sacrifices to the fellowship of the Jewish cultus, and as the Lord's Supper to the religious fellowship of Christianity. And in accordance with this fact he says, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?"—which can only mean that the Supper marks, represents, this communion, is the means of appropriating this communion; for the rite is here viewed as, in its totality, corresponding to the idea, in the congruity of the inward with the outward, in the same sense as when Paul says that as many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.* As to the two other points with which the Lord's Supper is here compared in its relation to Christianity, the only thing essential is a direction for the conscience in communion; respecting the kind of communion in the Supper nothing more can be ascertained from these words.

Since the Supper represents the communion with Christ, there is at the same time involved a reference to the communion founded upon it of believers with one another as members of the one body of Christ. With this view Paul says, 1 Cor. x. 17, "For we being many are one loaf and one body, for we are all partakers of that one loaf;" that is, as we all partake of one loaf, and this loaf represents to us the body of Christ, so it also signifies that we are all related to one another as members of the one body of Christ.†

The idea of the Church of Christ is closely connected in the views of Paul with that of the Kingdom of God. The former is the particular idea, which must be referred to the latter as the more general and comprehensive one. The idea of the church is subordinate to that of the kingdom of God, because by the latter is denoted, partly the whole of a series of historical developments, partly a great assemblage of co-existent spiritual creations. The first meaning leads us to the original form of the idea of the kingdom of God, by which the Christian dispensation was introduced and to which it was annexed. The universal kingdom of God formed from within, which is to embrace the whole human race, or the union of all mankind in one community animated by one common prin-

* The older Fathers of the church not illogically inferred, that there was a bodily participation of Christ at Baptism as well as at the Supper.

† In 1 Cor. xii. 13, there may be an allusion to the Supper in the words "have drunk into one Spirit," [*εἰς*] ἐν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν, and in this case to the participation in the "one Spirit," proceeding from spiritual communion with the Redeemer; this may be also the case in 1 Cor. x. 3, 4.

ciple of religion, was prepared and typified by the establishment and development of a national communion, distinguished by religion as the foundation and centre of all its social institutions, the particular Theocracy of the Jews. The kingdom of God was not first founded by Christianity as something entirely new, but the original kingdom of God, of which the groundwork already existed, was released from its limitation to a particular people and its symbolical garb; it was transformed from being a sensuous and external economy to one that was spiritual and internal; and no longer national, it assumed a form that was destined to embrace the whole of mankind; and thus it came to pass, that faith in that Redeemer, whom to prefigure and to prepare for was the highest office of Judaism, was the medium for all men of participating in the kingdom of God. The apostle everywhere represents, that those who had hitherto lived excluded from all historical connexion with the development of God's kingdom among mankind, had become, by faith in the Redeemer, fellow-citizens of the saints, members of God's household, built on the foundation laid by apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; Eph. ii. 19, 20. The same fact is represented by another image, that of the original root of the stock of the Theocracy in Judaism, in Rom. xi. 18. Christianity, then, allied itself to the expectation of a restoration and glorification of the Theocracy, which was preceded by an ever increasing sense of its fallen state among the Jews. Those who clung to a national and external Theocracy, looked forward to this glorification as something external, sensuous, and national. The Messiah, they imagined, would triumphantly exalt, by a divine and miraculous power, the depressed Theocracy of the Jews to a visible glory such as it had never before possessed, and establish a new, and exalted, unchangeable order of things, in place of the transitory earthly institutions which had hitherto existed. Thus the kingdom of the Messiah would appear as the perfected form of the Theocracy; as the final stage in the terrestrial development of mankind, exceeding in glory everything which a rude fancy could depict under sensible images; a kingdom in which the Messiah would reign sensibly present as God's viceroy, and order all circumstances according to his will. From this point of view, therefore, the reign of the Messiah would appear as belonging entirely to the future; the present condition of the world (the *αἰὼν οὗτος*, or *αἰὼν πονηρὸς*), with all its evils and defects, would be set in opposition to that future golden age (the *αἰὼν μέλλων*) from which all wickedness and evil would be banished. But in accordance with a change in the idea of the kingdom of God, a different construction was put on this opposition by Christianity; it was transformed from the external to the internal, and withdrawn from the future to the present. By faith in the Redeemer, the kingdom of God or of the Messiah is already founded in the hearts of men, and thence developing itself outwards, is destined to bring under its control all that belongs to man. And so that higher order of things, which to the Jewish mind was placed in the future, has already com-

menced with the divine life received by faith, and is realized in principle. In spirit and disposition they have already quitted the world in which evil reigns; redemption brings with it deliverance from this world of evil,* and believers, who already participate in the spirit, the laws, the powers, and the blessedness of that higher world, constitute an opposition to "this world," *αἰὼν οὗτος*, the "evil world," *αἰὼν πονηρός*. Such is the idea of the kingdom of God presented by the apostle as realized, in the spirit of it, on earth; the kingdom of Christ coincides with the idea of the church existing in the hearts of men, the invisible church,† the totality of the operations of Christianity on mankind;—and the idea of the *αἰὼν οὗτος* is that of the ungodly spirit of the present world maintaining an incessant conflict with Christianity.

But as we have already remarked in reference to the Christian life generally, as founded on the necessary connexion of the ideas of faith and hope, the Pauline conception of the kingdom of God necessarily contains a reference to the future; for as the Christian life of the individual is developed progressively by inward and outward conflicts, while aiming at that perfection which is never attained in this earthly existence, the same thing is also true of the manifestation of the kingdom of God on earth, which comprehends the totality of the Christian life diffused through the human race. The knowledge of the manifestation of the kingdom of God is necessarily accompanied by a recognition of this manifestation as still very obscure and imperfect, and by no means corresponding to its idea and real nature. Hence the idea of the kingdom

* Deliverance from the "present evil world," *ἐνεστώτος αἰὼν πονηρός*, necessarily accompanies redemption from sin. See Gal. i. 4.

† This is the "Jerusalem which is above," *ἡ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ*, the mother of believers; Gal. iv. 26. Rothe disputes this interpretation (see his work before quoted, p. 290), but without reason. He is indeed so far right, that, primarily, something future is designated by it, as appears from its being contrasted with "the Jerusalem which now is;" but this future heavenly Jerusalem, which at a future time is to be revealed in its glory, is to true believers something already present, for in faith and spirit and inward life they belong to it; while the earthly Jerusalem is, for them, something passed away; they are dead to it, and are separated from it. From this it follows that the heavenly Jerusalem stands to them in the relation of a mother; the participation of the divine life by which they are regenerated, and which represents itself in them, constitutes them the invisible church. The perfect development of this life belongs to the future; their life is now a hidden one; the manifestation of it does not fully correspond to its real nature. Though the idea of the invisible church is not expressed in this distinct form by Paul, yet in spirit and meaning it is conveyed in the above expression, as well as in the distinction which he makes in 2 Tim. ii. 19, 20; (see p. 450), and when he forms his idea of the body of Christ according to this distinction, it entirely coincides with that of the invisible church. Hence, also, this idea was strikingly developed by the Reformation which proceeded from the Pauline scheme of doctrine. And it is important to maintain it firmly against ecclesiastical sectarianism, against the secularization of the church, whether under the form of Hierarchy, of Romanism, or, what is still worse, of subordination of religion to political objects, the supremacy of the State in matters of religion, Byzantinism.

of God in its realization, can only be understood if we view it as now presenting the tendency and germ of what will receive its accomplishment in future, and this accomplishment Paul represents not as something which will spontaneously arise from the natural development of the church, but as produced, like the founding of the kingdom of Christ, by an immediate intervention of Christ himself. Hence the various applications of this term. Sometimes it denotes the present form assumed by the kingdom of God among mankind, the internal kingdom, which is established in the heart by the gospel; sometimes the future consummation, the perfected form of the victorious and all-transforming kingdom of God; at other times, the present in its union with the future and in reference to it. The conception of the idea of the kingdom of God in the first sense, is found in 1 Cor. iv. 20. The kingdom of God does not consist, the participation of it is not shown, in what we eat or drink, but in the power of the life; not in ostentatious discourse, as in the Corinthian church, but in the power of the disposition; Rom. xiv. 17. The kingdom of God is not meats and drinks—its blessings are not external and sensible, but internal, by possessing which we prove our participation in it, such as justification, peace in the inner man, and a sense of the blessedness of the divine life.* The reference to the future is introduced where he speaks of the reigning of believers," *συμβασιλεύειν* "with" Christ; and where he says, that those who, although they have received outward baptism and made an outward profession of Christianity, yet contradict it by the course of their lives, shall not inherit the kingdom of God; 1 Cor. vi. 10. The passage in 1 Thess. ii. 12, where Christians are called upon to conduct themselves in a manner worthy of that God who had called them to his kingdom and glory, has certainly a reference to the future, as far as the glory of this kingdom has not yet appeared; in 2 Thess. i. 5, the apostle says that Christians, as they already belong to this kingdom, fight and suffer as members of it, shall therefore have part in it when it shall appear in its consummation.

This requires our attentive consideration. At the time of which we are speaking, the church comprised the whole visible form of the kingdom of God; everything else stood in opposition to it; and yet the kingdom of God is destined to universal sovereignty,—to appropriate everything as its organ; as everything in humanity depends upon it, the kingdom of God must stamp its impress on the race before it can find the realiza-

* The connexion of this passage, Rom. xiv. 16, appears to me to be this: Give no occasion for the good which you possess as citizens of the kingdom of God (more particularly in the present instance, Christian freedom), to be spoken ill of by others; for it is not of such a kind that you need be afraid of losing it; even if you do not avail yourselves of your Christian freedom, if you neither eat nor drink what you are justified in partaking of as Christians, as free citizens of the kingdom of God. Your good is one that is situated within you, not dependent on these outward things; for the blessings of God's kingdom are not outward, or objects of sense, they are within you; they consist in what is godlike, as the apostle proceeds to specify.

tion of its true idea. Such an universal sovereignty in reserve for the kingdom of God, Paul certainly acknowledged; but the thought was then, and must have continued to be, not familiar to his mind, that such a supremacy of the kingdom of God was to be formed by that developing process which Christ compares to leaven, through the natural connexion of causes and effects under the Divine guidance. It was, as we have already shown, the necessary and natural view for this stage in the development of Christianity, that this supremacy of the kingdom would be brought about, under altogether different conditions from those of earthly existence, by the second advent of Christ. Hitherto, therefore, there could be no visible appearance of the kingdom of God beyond the pale of the church. Another relation of the ideas of the kingdom of God and of the church to one another, must be formed when the kingdom of God had more effectually exerted its power as leaven in the development of the human race—when by a natural instrumentality, preparation had been made for what, to Paul, appeared as something that must be realized in an immediate manner by a new external event—when the kingdom of God, which entered the world first of all in the form of the church, had appropriated to itself all other things which belonged to the organism of human life. Then the idea of the kingdom of God, in its earthly form of appearance, would become more extended than that of the church, which at this time could not have taken place.

But it is not merely in reference to the series of events which are advancing to their completion that the external form of the kingdom of God is presented as part of a great whole; there is another consideration which is naturally connected with this view. As the church is a seminary for the heavenly community, in which its members are training for their perfect development, it appears even here below as a part of a divine kingdom not confined to the human race, but comprehending also a higher spiritual world, where that archetype, to the realization of which mankind are now tending, is already realized. The knowledge of God, according to the comprehensive views of Christianity, is represented not merely as the common vitalizing principle of the human race, but as a bond by which mankind are united with all the orders of beings in a higher spiritual world, in one divine community, according to that universal idea of the kingdom of God which is presented in the Lord's Prayer. Thus Paul represents "God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," not merely as the common Father of mankind, but also as Him after whom the whole community in heaven and on earth are named; Eph. iii. 15. By sin men were estranged, not only from God, but from that higher spiritual world in which the kingdom of God is already realized. As Christ, when he reconciled men to God, united them to one another in a divine community, broke down the wall of partition (Eph. ii. 14) which separated them, and joined Jews and Gentiles in one body, which is animated by himself as their head; so also while men are brought back to communion with God, they are connected with all those

who have already attained that degree of perfection in the kingdom of God to which the church on earth is aspiring. In this respect Paul says, that Christ, in making peace, has united all things in heaven and on earth in one divine kingdom; Coloss. i. 20.*

We here come to the important idea of a pre-existent Divine Being, who, through Christ, became manifested in time—the idea, to designate which we may, for brevity's sake, use the term *Logos*, though this distinct term for designating such an idea belongs only to a peculiar doctrinal type of the New Testament. Also on this subject we must maintain, in opposition to the arbitrary, unhistorical, destructive theories of a certain mode of thinking in our day, which is necessitated to find in all things only the human spirit seating itself in its self-reflection on the throne of God, that not a foreign element from without was introduced in the development of the doctrine that proceeded from Christ—also, that not from without, through many influences, has that been developed at which the idea of Christianity aims, and for which Christ only gave the first impulse; but we must here deduce everything from the original

* The passage in Col. i. 20, certainly has special difficulties which we shall consider further on. Although the view taken by Paul of the world of spirits is represented to us and more fully developed in the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians, which may be explained by their being written in the later period of his ministry, amid the opposing opinions that had then arisen; yet this cannot be considered as a mark of anything un-Pauline, for it can be easily proved that such a view of the various orders in the world of spirits was always held by the apostle, and that the relation of men to a world of good and evil spirits was always present to his mind; Rom. viii. 38, "angels, principalities, powers," ἄγγελοι, ἀρχαὶ, δυνάμεις, of this or the other world; 1 Cor. iv. 9; xii. 4. Also in 1 Cor. xv. 24, by the universality with which he expresses himself, he can hardly be supposed to mean only the "rule, authority, and power" of this world, but must, to say the least, refer at the same time to the invisible regions. The manner is characteristic in which Paul joins together the evil in the visible and invisible worlds as one, and subjects the evil angels to the judgment of those who have become one with Christ, and who reign and judge with him. As to the passage in 1 Cor. xi. 10, I have often doubted, with Dr. Baur, the genuineness of the words "because of the angels," διὰ τοὺς ἄγγέλους, since these words, after a sufficient reason has already been given for the injunction, seem a superfluous addition to the "for this cause," διὰ τοῦτο. I have also been led to the same supposition as Dr. Baur, that the words may have been brought as a gloss into the text from the stand-point of a representation derived from the apocryphal Book of Enoch, relative to the intercourse of the fallen angels with the daughters of men; Gen. vi. 2. 'Women ought to be veiled, as a protection against the temptations and plots of the evil spirits.' Yet I do not venture to speak on this point with such confidence as Dr. Baur, for I can attach a meaning to these words which will be very agreeable to Paul's mode of viewing such subjects. Paul, always mindful of the connexion between the visible and invisible world, contemplates the angels as witnesses of the devotions of the church. Angels and men, as members of one kingdom of God that exists under one head, unite together in common acts of devotion to God. Now the women ought to be afraid to appear before such eyes in a manner, which is inconsistent with the natural proprieties of the female sex, and which would mark a perversion of the female character. We must certainly attach a symbolic moral meaning to the veiling. Also in 1 Cor. ix. 23 we find an example, though not perfectly analogous, where a clause with ἵνα, as marking a special object, is added to an assertion for which a sufficient reason had already been given with διὰ.

revelation of Christ, and prove that everything is already placed in his self-revelation as to its essence, germ, and principle. We must only distinguish the various and the successively preparatory stages to show how what was contained originally in his Divine-human consciousness, and given in his self-revelation, was developed in the consciousness and the preaching of those who testified of him.

As in the doctrine promulgated by Christ himself, we find the fulfilment and explanation of the Old Testament teachings given together, but in the developing process of apostolic Christianity fulfilment and explanation appear separately in successive stages, and we behold the unfolding of Christianity from its closest connexion with the Old Testament to its perfectly independent development when it threw aside the Old Testament covering; so also we can distinguish between the conception of the person of Christ, which was connected with the predominant Old Testament idea of the Messiah, and that view which, proceeding from the Old Testament, and stretching away from earth to heaven, contemplates the Divine Word becoming flesh, first of all anointed with the fulness of the Divine Spirit before he came forward as the Messiah, then known as the preëxistent Son of God who appeared in time and manifested his glory, the medium of transition from the historical revelation of the divine to Him who was before history and was above history. There is here a progressive organic development, of which the members reciprocally conditionate one another; but everything leads back to what was in the historical Christ, and to his original self-revelation. The first three Gospels and the Acts correspond to the first stage of Messianic conceptions; while there are not wanting also, in these first three Gospels, intimations which denote or imply that higher idea of the Son of God as it was developed by Paul and John; Matt. xi. 27; xii. 44; xxviii. 18, 20.* The total impression given by the Christ of these Gospels would lead any one who receives it with a susceptible disposition, to recognise a Divine form letting itself down from heaven to earth. From several pregnant single expressions, as when he said, "In this place is one greater than the temple," Matt. xii. 6, and from taking into account what the temple was to the Jewish religious sentiment, and what it must be on the first stage of theocratic development, we shall also be led to recognise such a Christ in the first Gospels, otherwise we cannot forbear charging him with impious self-deification, or we must apply the scalpel of an arbitrary criticism, and let the whole be dissolved into something as unsubstantial as a mist. The predicate "Son of Man," *υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, the Messiah appearing as a man, who realized the original type of humanity, and exalted human nature to the highest dignity, and the predicate "the Son of God," *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*, which on Christ's lips denoted something more than the common Jewish idea of the Messiah, refer reciprocally to one

* Compare the admirable remarks of Baumgarten-Crusius in his *Grundzüge der biblischen Theologie*, p. 378.

another, and imply the distinction as well as the combination and the unity of the Divine and the human in him.*

But the development of theology from the Old Testament point of view also favored this revelation of the higher image of Christ; and to what resulted from the developing process of the divine appearances in the Old Testament, ideas which sprung up on the soil of Grecian philosophy were afterwards to be joined, in order to render accessible to the human mind these visible presentations of the Divine. The Messianic idea of the Old Testament had already in some special features (as in Isaiah ix. 6) been exalted from the earthly to the superhuman, the Divine, and shown how this ideal of the theocratic king in his essence must transcend the limits of a mere human appearance. It was an idea which, though at first representing itself in a historical, earthly form of appearance, was yet pregnant with a significance which necessarily tended to the super-earthly and the heavenly. The revelation of God in the Old Testament, led to the visible presentation of a WORD forming the connexion between the creation and the eternal, hidden essence of God, and this Word pointed to the idea of an eternal self-revelation of God as a pre-supposition of the whole creation, in which it had its root, and without which no thought from God or leading to God could arise in the human soul. It is a prevailing error to deduce all this from the influence of Grecian philosophy. It is true, that Platonic and Stoical ideas of a Logos afterwards gave Philo points of connexion for Grecising such an idea; but certainly, had not such an idea already formed itself from the Old Testament "word," **דבר**, he would have had no occasion to select such a term to express the idea. In Philo himself we must carefully distinguish what he had received from the traditions of Jewish theology, and what he made of that theology by the aid of his Græco-Jewish religious philosophy. The conception that was derived from the religious development of the Old Testament, and then through the Alexandrian theology brought into connexion with the ideas of the Grecian philosophy, formed a natural transition-point from *legal* Judaism which placed an infinite chasm between God and man, to the gospel which was to fill up this chasm, since it revealed a God communicating himself to mankind, and establishing a fellowship of life between himself and them. The ideas of a divine utterance, which limited all becoming to the creation—of a word by which God operates and reveals himself in the world—of an angel representing God and speaking in his name—of a divine wisdom presupposed through the universe—were so many connecting links for a contemplation which ascended from a revelation of God in the world, to his most absolute self-revelation. And it was a result of this mode of contemplation, that the appearance of Him who was to effect the realization of the idea of the theocracy and was its end, to whom all its preceding development had pointed as the most perfect self-revelation

* See Life of Christ, pp. 94–97.

and communication of God in human nature, was acknowledged as the human appearance of the Word, from whom the whole creation and all the early revelations of God, the whole development of the theocracy, proceeded. Where the idea of the Messiah was freed from its popular theocratic garb, it necessarily assumed that higher element of the idea of a communication of the Divine Being in the form of human nature, since this element, in accordance with what we have before remarked, had already been prepared through the progressive development of the prophetic element in the Old Testament.

Certainly it could be nothing merely accidental which induced men so differently constituted and trained as Paul and John, to connect such an idea with the doctrine of the person of Christ, but must have been the result of a higher necessity, founded in the nature of Christianity, in the power of the impression which the life of Christ had made on the minds of men, in the reciprocal relation between the appearance of Christ and the archetype that presents itself as an inward revelation of God in the depths of the higher self-consciousness. Had this doctrine, when it was first promulgated by Paul, been altogether new and peculiar to himself, it must have excited much opposition, as contradicting the common monotheistic belief of the Jews, even among the apostles, to whom from their previous habits, such a speculative or theosophic element must have remained unknown, unless it had found a point of connexion in the contents of the pattern received from Christ and in their Christian consciousness. What opposition had Paul to encounter—though Peter had already prepared his way—when he asserted the validity of the gospel apart from the observance of the ceremonial law! But *this* doctrine of Christ was equally opposed to common Judaism, which, when it afterwards appeared in a Christian form, directed its opposition against Christianity (which appeared as a new independent creation affecting both doctrine and practice) principally on this point. Certainly this Judaism can appear to no impartial observer of historical development, as a reaction of the original elements of the doctrine of Christ against foreign adulterations, but rather a reaction of the Jewish spirit against the spirit of Christianity, which had broken through the Jewish forms in which it was at first enveloped, and had developed itself into the new creation designed by its divine Founder. Thus, too, the doctrine of the Son of God, as the Son of Man in the sense of John and Paul, was not a mere isolated element accidentally mingled with Christianity, but was closely connected with the whole nature of its doctrines and morals. God is no more a God at an infinite distance, but revealed in man; a divine life in human form. But this peculiar principle of Christian morals, the idea of the pure humanity transformed by a divine life, obtains its true significance only in connexion with the doctrine of the historical Christ as the God-man, the Redeemer of sinful humanity which from him must first receive the divine life, and persevere in constant, unreserved dependence on him. The self-deification of Pantheism, which denies alike the God and the Christ

of the gospel, rests upon an entirely different basis, and is essentially opposed to it. In Christianity, the controlling elements of the inward life are a consciousness of dependence on One Being, of a state of pupillage in relation to him, a surrender of the soul to him with a sense of want, in order to receive from him what man cannot derive from himself, the key-tone of humility; in the anti-Christian self-deification of Pantheism there is a consciousness of self-sufficiency in a supposed oneness with God, who first comes to consciousness in humanity. Hence we see how enormous a falsehood it is, when men make use of sounding Christian phrases for conveying sentiments utterly at variance with their genuine meaning, as has often been done of late years; as when a denial of God, which is degrading to man, adorns itself with the name of Humanism, that belongs in its true sense only to Christianity which exalts man to the consciousness of his true dignity, the dignity of the image of God and of destination to eternal life, and alone can enable him to attain to it.

It has been maintained, indeed, that the Christology which we here attribute to Paul, is only to be found in the Epistles to the Colossians and the Philippians, and this is urged as a proof of the un-Pauline character of these Epistles; but we must maintain in spite of all such arbitrary and absurd attempts at interpretation, that in the larger and universally acknowledged Pauline Epistles the same Christology forms the groundwork, which appears in a more striking, because antithetic form, in the Epistle to the Colossians. The words in the fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians, ver. 4, "God sent forth his Son," *ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ*, manifestly contain the idea that God sent out his Son from himself, and that therefore he was with him before he appeared in the world; as when in the sixth verse, Paul says, "God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts," *ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν*, it is implied that the Spirit sent into the hearts of believers came forth from the depths of the Divine Being, and in consequence effects the connexion of believing souls with God. Here the words of Paul in 1 Cor. viii. 6, are particularly applicable, where he points out the characteristics of the Christian's religious consciousness. 'But to us there is one God, the Father, from whom all existence proceeds, and we are for him, (he is the end of our being,) for his glory: and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom all things were brought into existence, and we are through him.' This passage cannot be otherwise understood, than that the "by whom all things," *ὃς οὗ τὰ πάντα* corresponds to the "of whom all things," *ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα*, and both therefore are equally comprehensive, and thus the "we by him," *ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ* refers itself back to the "we in him," *ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν*. Accordingly, the passage affirms that, as all existence proceeds from God, so through Jesus Christ as the one Mediator, in relation especially to the pre-existent Divine nature in him, all things were introduced into actual existence, and as Christians are conscious that God alone ought to be the end of their

being, so the realization of this destiny is accomplished through Christ, by virtue of the new creation that proceeds from him. So Paul here combines in one view of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Divine and the human, contemplates him in reference to these two great points, as the mediating Being, by whom the whole universe was at first called into existence, and by whom not only the original creation, but *that* creation has been brought into being which is destined to realize the end of the first.*

The exposition of this last passage admits of less doubt than that of 1 Cor. x. 4, where Paul represents the water from the rock, and the manna which was given to the Jews in the wilderness, as symbols of the communion with Christ effected by the Lord's Supper. "They all drank of that spiritual rock that followed them," says Paul, "and that rock was Christ." Now, this would not imply the Messianic preëxistence, if we understand it to mean—the rock represented Christ: was a symbol of him. But it certainly agrees better with Paul's train of ideas if we take it in this sense:—that Christ himself was the rock who furnished the manna and water to the Jews, as he now communicates himself to believers in the Supper. Now, if we are not justified from any other quarter in assuming the idea in Paul's writings of such a Messianic preëxistence, we must content ourselves with such a dilution of his meaning in that passage as is offered in the first interpretation. Likewise, if in 1 Cor. x. 9, "Lord," *κύριον*, is the genuine reading, but "Christ," *Χριστόν*, a correct gloss, this necessarily indicates that when Paul said of the Jews in the wilderness, "they tempted Christ," *ἐπείρασαν τὸν Χριστόν*, he implied that Christ was acting among them according to his Divine nature. The words in 2 Cor. viii. 9, ('For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be made rich') are also certain evidence that Paul's views were such as we have stated. It is impossible to understand these words as Baur (p. 628) has explained them in order to do away with their obvious inference. "That Christ was poor, *i. e.* lived in poverty and a lowly condition, although as Redeemer, through the grace of redemption which we owe to him, he was rich enough to make us rich." Certainly, the "being rich" forms a contrast to the "being poor," but the riches of his grace would form no such contrast. To be rich in grace, and to live in poverty and a lowly condition, are perfectly compatible. And it is here intended to exhibit Christ as a pattern of self-sacrifice and self-denial, that men may learn to give up what they might otherwise enjoy, in order to help others. But how could this agree with such an exposition? We know not how to understand it, when Baur, who cannot deny this reference of the words, will not acknowledge what is im-

* Baur (p. 627) would limit the "by whom all things," *δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα*, to all things which relate to reconciliation and redemption; but this is absolutely impossible, as will be evident to every unprejudiced person on an examination of the context. The words in 2 Cor. v. 18, where the limitation plainly proceeds from the connexion, are not at all parallel to the passage before us.

plied, but thinks they may be thus explained :—"That we must show the same self-sacrificing disposition as Christ, who was poor and in a lowly condition, though he was so exalted above us by the riches of his grace." Where is the contrast, and where is the example of self-sacrifice? Although the word *πτωχεύειν* in itself, according to the Greek usage, only denotes "being poor," yet in the words, "for our sakes he was poor," and in the contrast "though he was rich," *πλούσιος ὢν*, it is necessarily understood that he was before rich, and for our sakes became poor. The words cannot be understood in any other sense than this: He who was rich in divine glory, has on our account taken part in our poverty; he has entered within the limitations and wants of our earthly existence, in order that by means of this his self-humiliation we might partake of the riches of his Divine life, which without it we could not have done. Again, when Paul in Rom. viii. 3, says, God sent forth his Son "in the likeness of sinful flesh," *ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας*, these words imply the preëxistence of the Son of God *not in the flesh, οὐκ ἐν σαρκί*. The passage in Rom. ix. 5, can certainly not be made use of, in an isolated form, to prove from it Paul's doctrinal views, since it requires for its own interpretation an appeal to Paul's known mode of thinking elsewhere, and has, undeniably, great difficulties. Yet we must admit we cannot feel satisfied with the explanation that Paul must have ended the sentence with the words, "from whom, according to the flesh, Christ came," without adding anything more. He who was so fond of contrasts, and whom the consciousness of the glory of Christ, of which he was always full, would here prompt to the expression of a contrast, must, in truth, have felt himself compelled to express more strongly what he brought forward as the culminating point of the whole—the last end of the theocratic development which was to proceed from the Jews; we cannot think that he would have ended in so bald a manner. Neither can we admit, that the doxology to God the Father should be added in this way without any intermediate link; this whole doxology would be uncommonly heavy, and quite un-Pauline. Hence we must regard that as the most natural exposition, according to which the words referred to, form a contrast to the preceding "according to the flesh," *κατὰ σάρκα*, and give emphasis to the meaning of the great preëminence which accrued to the Jews from the Messiah's being born of them. "He who is God exalted over all," (exalted above all that is named in the preceding clauses,) or perhaps still better thus, avoiding the encumbrance of the *ὁ ὢν*: 'The Being exalted over all, be praised as the Divine Being for ever.' We certainly admit that Paul would not have conferred the title "God," *ὁ Θεός*, simply, upon Christ, but it is something different when, in reference to his derived, communicated nature, he calls him God. And as he now attributes such exaltation to him, and represents him as the Being in whom all the communications of divine blessing to mankind are concentrated, he might be well induced to ascribe the doxology to him. That this does not occur elsewhere, cannot serve as a proof that Paul

could not once have done this in a given connexion. The words of Paul in Rom. i. 4, contain nothing whatever inconsistent with this view. He there refers to the Son of God in his two-fold relation,—in his state of humiliation, when he had subjected himself to the limitations of earthly humanity, and as he went beyond it when the dignity attached to him as the Son of God was revealed, so that his Divine essence unveiled itself, free from the limitations of nature by which it had hitherto been kept back. The Son of God, who according to his earthly appearance was born of the posterity of David (the Messiah peculiarly belonging to the Jewish people), by means of the indwelling spirit of holiness (the Divine nature peculiar to him) was proved to be the Son of God by his resurrection, or in virtue of his resurrection, (for this event was indeed the beginning of his emerging from the limits of an existence subjected to nature,) in order that henceforward, in correspondence to the essence of the Son of God, the “spirit of holiness,” *πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης*, in him, he might operate with a power raised above all limits, invisible and Divine—the theocratic King and Redeemer belonging equally to the whole human race.

Since Paul contemplated the Redeemer equally on the side of his Divine preëxistence and on that of his human appearance, he united under one point of view the reference to the universe of created beings in general, and to the new spiritual creation in particular which was introduced among mankind by the gospel; or in other words, the universal Kingdom of God which embraces the whole spiritual world, and that particular Kingdom established in the form of a Church on earth. Paul was led to exhibit this twofold reference in its unity in his Epistle to the Colossians, for the purpose of combating the pretensions of certain notions then in vogue respecting spirits, although, as we have shown, the same doctrinal view lay at the basis of what he has expressed in his earlier Epistles. When Paul, in 2 Cor. iv. 4, describes Christ as the image of God, in whom the glory of God is mirrored forth, the same train of ideas is implied, which, more fully unfolded by an antithetical reference, meets us in the Epistle to the Colossians. He who is the image of the hidden incomprehensible God, he in whom that God revealed himself before all created existence, he who bore in himself the Archetype of all existences,* in whom all earthly and heavenly beings, all invisible as well as visible powers, have been created, by whom and† in reference to whom all things are created, who is before all,‡ and in whom (in connexion with whom)

* Col. i. 16, the “by (in) him,” *ἐν αὐτῷ*, must be carefully distinguished from the “by him,” *δι’ αὐτοῦ*: the former indicating the foundation of being in idea, as the Logos is the ideal ground of all existence; the latter, the instrument for the realization of the Divine idea.

† Inasmuch as the revelation and glory of God in the creation can be effected only through him, in whom alone God reveals himself, through him everything refers itself to God.

‡ The *ἐστὶν* denotes the divine existence, but also with a particular reference to the *ἐστὶν* in v. 18.

all beings continue to exist,—the same Being, therefore, who is the Head of all, of the whole all-comprehending kingdom of God, is also the Head of the Church which belongs to him as his body (by virtue of his entering into communion corporeally with human nature); since he, as the first-born from the dead, has become the first-fruits of the new creation among mankind, that he may be the first of every order of beings, as the “first-born of every creature” (rather of the whole creation), *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*, so also the first-born of the new creation, *πρωτότοκος τῆς καινῆς κτίσεως*.^{*} According to his divine being, deduced from the original of the Divine essence before the whole creation, he forms the medium for the origination of all created existence; as the Risen One before all others in glorified human nature, he forms the medium for the new spiritual creation which proceeds from him among mankind. With this view also is connected the manner in which Paul expresses himself in Phil. ii. 5–9, ‘That whereas Christ found himself in a state of Divine existence, he did not assert that equality to God and that Divine existence which he possessed,[†] nor was he eager to let it come forth that he might[‡] make a show with it, but on the contrary, he renounced it when he entered into the dependent relations of a creaturely human existence, and was born as a man like other men, although under the covering of this visible form was hidden[§] something exalted above human nature and the whole created universe. The exaltation which followed this self-humiliation, and by which the obedience rendered by him in the form of a servant was rewarded, cannot be referred to that in which according to his Divine essence he was already exalted above all, but only to the man who had come forth from that act of self-humiliation; who as a man, conscious of his Divine nature, carried this act of self-renunciation to its last degree. We must enter into the distinction of ideas which Paul himself does not apply,^{||} his language giving us only a single view. By so

^{*} It cannot be urged against this interpretation, that if Paul had intended to mark the reference to the Divine and human, he would have pointedly marked the distinction of the “according to the flesh,” *κατὰ σάρκα*, and “according to the Spirit,” *κατὰ πνεῦμα*, for when Paul uses such marks, he wishes to render the antithesis prominent; but here it is his main design, along with the distinction, to mark the unity of the subject, and therefore it would have been contrary to his intention to have marked the contrast more sharply. In the former passage (Rom. i. 3, 4) the dialectic element predominates, but here the soaring of inspiration.

[†] Here Christ is plainly distinguished from Him who alone, as source and original ground of all, is called God, *ὁ θεός*. Also in the passage in Titus ii. 13, I cannot forbear regarding the great God and the Saviour as two distinct subjects. “It is Christ our Saviour through whom the glory of the great God is revealed.” The form of expression, “The great God who gave himself for us,” were wholly un-Pauline. Compare the remarks of the impartial Winer in his Grammar, p. 142.

[‡] See above, page 411.

[§] The contrast between the inward nature and the outward form of appearance, lies in the “in the likeness of men,” *ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων*, Phil. ii. 7.

^{||} To many questions which later theologians have started and attempted, after their manner, to answer, Paul gave no attention whatever, (as Schleiermacher has justly re-

doing we shall find here no contradiction which would oblige us to drag in Gnostic ideas, of which we do not perceive the least trace; there is, indeed, nothing more than what we have already found in 2 Cor. viii. 9; Rom. viii. 3.*

The idea of the Kingdom of God has also in Paul's writings an essential reference to a Kingdom of Evil. Although evil carries with it only division and internal contradiction, and forms no unity, and therefore we cannot speak of a kingdom of evil that is constituted for one precise object, yet its opposition against the kingdom of God imparts a unity to all the diversified manifestations of evil. As the kingdom of God, according to the Pauline views, in its most extensive sense, passes beyond the boundaries of earthly existence, and embraces the totality of the development of the divine life in all those beings who are destined to exhibit a conscious revelation of their Maker, so likewise the opposition against the kingdom of God is represented by the Apostle as of vast extent and diversified relations. He considers the prevalence of sin in mankind to stand in connexion with the prevalence of evil in the higher spiritual world; the principle of sin is everywhere the same,—the selfishness striving against the Divine will in those rational beings who were designed to subordinate their will to God's with consciousness and freedom. All other evil is traced by Paul to the outbreak of this opposition in the rational creation as its primary source. As all sin among mankind is deduced from the original sin at the beginning of the race, and is considered as its effect, so all evil, generally, is viewed in connexion with that first evil, and as the operation of the same fundamental tendency. This is of importance in relation to the whole doctrine of sin. Had Paul, according to the views (see above,) ascribed to him by some, considered evil as only something necessarily grounded in the intellectual and sensuous development of human nature, and the first man as in this respect a type of all mankind, the idea of an evil extraneous to mankind in a world of higher intelligences, could have found in his mind no point of connexion. But it constitutes the importance of this doctrine in relation to Christian Theism, that the *reality* and *inexplicability* of sin as an act of the will is thereby firmly established, in opposition to all attempts at explaining it, which go to deny the very existence of freedom, and deduce evil from a necessity which classes moral development with the chain of causes and effects in nature.† Thus the apostle recognises in all the un-

marked in his Church History, p. 75,) notwithstanding the advantage he had over later theologians in the fullness and depth of views which in an immediate manner were communicated to him through the illumination of the Divine Spirit.

* See above, page 465.

† This has been recognized in the light of an ethico-religious idealism by Kant, whose earnest moral spirit (on this point at least) approaches much nearer to biblical Christianity, than do the modern pantheistic deification of ideas, and the logical monism of those who fancy they can reconcile, by dint of logic, those contrarieties in human nature

godliness of men, whether it assumes a theoretical or a practical form, the power of a principle of darkness—a spirit which is active in unbelievers.* The *αὐτὸς οὗτος* and the *κόσμος οὗτος* are the terms used to express the totality of everything which opposes the kingdom of God, the collective assemblage of the ungodly, the kingdom of this spirit which is the representative of evil in general.†

which only admit of a practical settlement. See Kant's *Religion innerhalb der Gränzen der blossen Vernunft*.

* Eph. ii. 2. Τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ νῦν ἐνεργούντος ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας.

† Paul must naturally have regarded heathenism in itself (as a suppression by sin of the knowledge of God) as belonging to the kingdom of the evil spirit. But though the opinion that the apostle adopted the notion of the Jews, that the heathen gods were evil spirits who influenced men to pay them religious homage, has met with several advocates in modern times, much may be urged against it. When Paul speaks of the origin of idolatry in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, it would have been a most natural opportunity for saying, that men through sin were given up to the influence of evil spirits, and were seduced by them to transfer to them the homage that was due to the living God. It would have marked more strongly the abominableness of idolatry, and the predominance of unnatural lusts, to which he there refers, if he could have traced them to the influence of evil spirits, to whom men, esteeming them to be divinities, had subjected themselves. But we find nothing of all this; Paul speaks merely of the transference to earthly things of the homage due to God, and he deduces all the enormities he specifies solely from the moral and intellectual course of development among men left to themselves. In Gal. iv. 8, when he says of those who had before been heathens, that they had served what was no god, as if it were God, it is noways implied that they considered other real beings or evil spirits to be gods; but only that they had made themselves slaves of the "elements of the world," *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*, instead of serving God alone, as became the dignity of human nature. The *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου* are the objects to which they ascribed divine power (see p. 426.) In reference to the Corinthian church, I cannot retract the opinion I expressed above, *ante*, p. 231. I cannot so understand the passage in 1 Cor. viii. 7, as if the persons indicated by Paul were Christians who could not altogether free themselves from faith in the reality of the heathen divinities as such; for, according to the relation in which Christianity at that time stood to heathenism, it is utterly inconceivable that, among those who became Christians, such a mixture could be formed of their earlier polytheistic views with Christian monotheism. Still, if they could not free themselves from belief in the reality of beings who had formerly exercised so great an influence over their minds, those whom they once held to be divinities must have appeared to them as evil spirits, in consequence of the total revolution in their modes of thinking. But if this be assumed, Paul could not at the same time hold as correct that view which he regards as peculiar to the weak. He declares, moreover, that the views of the liberal party in the Corinthian church were correct in theory, but they proceeded on the supposition that the heathen divinities were only imaginary beings, and that for this reason the eating of the meat offered to them was a matter of perfect indifference. In 1 Cor. viii. 5, he contrasts only two subjective positions in religion, without speaking of the relation to the objective. The passage in 1 Cor. x. 20, is the strongest in favor of the view which we are here opposing. But we must determine the meaning of this verse by comparing it with verse 19. If we admitted that Paul considered the heathen divinities to be evil spirits, we must agree with Billroth (see his commentary on this passage), that he wished to guard against that misunderstanding to which the preceding comparison might have given rise, as if he really acknowledged their divinities to be actually divine. But, as we have already remarked, no member of the Corinthian

Jesus appeared in humanity to destroy the Kingdoms of Sin and of Satan. All the powers of evil arrayed themselves against the Holy One of God ; his death, in which was manifested the mighty power of the kingdom of darkness among mankind, seemed to be their most splendid triumph, for here the mightiest opponent of this kingdom succumbed to their machinations. But the relation was reversed ; and since the sufferings of Christ were the completion of his work of redemption, since Christ by his resurrection and ascension to heaven manifested the victorious power of the redemption he had completed, since now as the Glorified One, with the power of a divine life that overcame all opposition, he continued to work in and by those whom he had redeemed from the power of sin and Satan,—it was precisely by that event which appeared as a victory of the kingdom of darkness that its power was destroyed. In this connexion Paul says, in Coloss. ii. 15, that Christ by his redeeming sufferings had gained a triumph over the powers that opposed the Kingdom of God, and had put them openly to shame, just as the chiefs of vanquished nations are led in a triumphal procession as signs of the destruction of the hostile force,—thus the power of evil now appeared to be destroyed. And a similar image in Eph. iv. 8 represents Christ, after he had made prisoners of the powers opposed to him, as ascending victoriously to heaven, and distributing gifts among men as the tokens of his triumph, just as princes are wont to celebrate their victories by the distribution of donatives. These gifts are the charisms.* As the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, the impartation of divine life to believers, and especially the founding of a church animated by a divine principle of life, are proofs of the conquest over the kingdom of evil, and of the liberation of the redeemed from its power ; so likewise the manifold operations of this divine life in redeemed human nature, are so many marks of Christ's victory over the kingdom of evil, since those powers belonging to man, which formerly were employed in the service of sin, are now become the organs of the divine life. Now, through redemption, the power of the kingdom of darkness is broken, and a foundation is laid for the complete victory of the kingdom of God and its total separation from all evil. But till this final consummation is effected, the

church could be supposed to entertain such an opinion, nor can it be supposed that they could so have misunderstood the language of Paul, who always maintained so strongly an exclusive monotheism. On the other hand, his words might be so understood, as if he considered these divinities to be real beings (though evil spirits), and hence ascribed an objective importance to what was offered to them. And in opposition to this mistake, he now says that he speaks only of the subjective conceptions of the heathen which stood in opposition to Christian views, and with which Christians could enter into no sort of communion, that those beings to whom they sacrificed were divinities, *δαίμόνια*, in the Grecian sense of the term. When Dr. Baur, from the tripod of his pretended science, declares authoritatively that what I have said is, some of it incorrect, and some of it obscure, this disturbs me not at all. To arguments I will reply.

* See p. 136.

kingdom of Christ can only develop itself in continued conflict with the kingdom of evil, for the power of the latter is still shown in them who have not been freed from it by redemption, and by them the kingdom of God as it exists in the believer is opposed, though all that opposes it must in the end contribute to its victory. And even in the redeemed themselves, points of connexion with the kingdom of evil exist, as far as their lives are not purified from a mixture of ungodliness. Hence Christians are called to act as soldiers for the kingdom of Christ, 2 Tim. ii. 3, against all the power of evil, both that which meets them from without in their efforts for the extension and promotion of the kingdom of Christ among mankind, as well as against all from within, which threatens to disturb the operations of the divine life in themselves, and in so doing to retard the intensive advancement of Christ's kingdom, Eph. vi. 11. It is the dictate of practical Christian morals, that as every talent is transformed into a charism, it becomes appropriated for this divine equipment of the *militia Christi*. If Christians only rightly appropriate divine truth, and make all the powers of their nature subservient to it, they will find therein the most complete equipment (the *πανοπλία τοῦ θεοῦ*) in order to carry on this warfare successfully. Whenever Paul mentions this invisible kingdom of evil, it is always in connexion with the presupposed sinful direction of the will in human nature, for the doctrine of Satan can only be rightly understood by means of the idea of sin derived from our moral experience. In the copious discussion on the nature and origin of sin, and on the reaction of the work of redemption against sin, which is given in the Epistle to the Romans, Satan is not mentioned; and when Paul first turned to the heathen and led them to the faith, he certainly appealed at first only to the consciousness of sin in their own breasts, as in his discourse at Athens. Moreover, he always contemplated this doctrine in connexion with the redemption accomplished by Christ. Believers have reason to fear the invisible powers of darkness only when they expose themselves to their influence by the sinful direction of their will, and are not careful to make a right use of the means granted them, in communion with Christ, for conflict with the kingdom of evil, that kingdom which the Redeemer has overcome once for all. Paul employs this doctrine to arouse believers to greater watchfulness, that, under the consciousness of an opposing invisible power which avails itself of every germ of evil as a point of connexion, they may carefully watch and allow nothing of the kind to spring up; and that they may rightly appropriate and use the divine weapons furnished by the gospel against all temptation; 2 Cor. ii. 10, 11; Eph. vi. 12.

We have now to speak of the gradual development of the Kingdom of Christ, as it advances in conflict with the kingdom of evil until the period of its completion.

With respect to the manner in which both nations and individuals are led by the publication of the gospel to a participation in the kingdom of God, Paul deduces the counsel of redemption and everything belong-

ing to its completion, both generally and particularly, from the free disposal of the grace of God, irrespective of any merit on the part of man. The peculiar form of his doctrinal scheme is closely connected with the manner in which he was changed from being an eager persecutor of the gospel into its zealous professor and publisher. And this free movement of grace, not measured and determined according to human merit, he brings forward in opposition to a theory equally arrogant and contracted, according to which admission to the kingdom of God was determined by the merits of a legal righteousness; the Jewish people, by virtue of the merits and election of their progenitors, were supposed to have an unalienable right to form the main-pillar and centre of the Theocracy. Accordingly, he contemplates the free arrangements of grace in a two-fold contrast; in contrast to claims founded on natural descent from distinguished ancestors, and a peculiar theocratic nation—and to claims founded on the meritoriousness of a legal righteousness.

In reference to the first of these claims, he makes the contrast, on the one hand, of natural descent determined by law, and therefore founded in a law of natural development,—what belongs to the sphere of the *σαρκικὸν*; on the other hand, a development not to be calculated according to such a law of nature, but one which depends on the free disposal of divine grace and of the divine Spirit; the arrangement according to which the promise is fulfilled as the work of God's free grace—the *κατὰ πνεῦμα, πνευματικόν*. In the former case, the development of the kingdom of God proceeds by outward propagation and transmission—in the latter, a development ensues in virtue of the invisible and internal connexion of the operations of the divine Spirit, and of the communication of divine life. Paul illustrates this universal contrast,* this law for the theocratical development through all ages by a particular example, the example of Abraham's posterity, from whom the Jews deduced their theocratic privileges. He points out how, among the immediate posterity of Abraham, not that son was chosen who would have carried on the line of his descendants according to the common course of nature, but one who was, according to a special promise, miraculously born† contrary to all human calculation; that this latter, and not the former, was destined to be the instrument of fulfilling the divine promises, and of continuing the theocracy; the law for the continued development of which was thus pointed out. Tradition was thus placed in contrast with that which is accomplished from within by the creation of the divine Spirit, with that which ensues from a law that acts by necessity, and so cannot be measured or accounted for, and with that which depends on the free actions

* The same contrast, which has ever again made its appearance among the conflicting views in the Christian Church, the contrast between Judaism in a Christian form, as in Catholicism and other related modes of thinking, and the free evangelical point of view of the visible church depending for its development on the invisible efficiency of the divine word.

† *κατὰ πνεῦμα, not κατὰ σάρκα*; Gal. iv.

of the Spirit. Most unjustly has Paul been charged here with an arbitrary allegorizing which could carry weight only with the readers of that age.

We do not here perceive in him a theologian entangled in Jewish prejudices, who could not act contrary to the education he had received in the school of Pharisaism, but a great master in the interpretation of history, who in particular facts could discern general laws and types, and knew how to reduce the most complex phenomena to fixed and ever-recurring single laws. Thus he here infers, with perfect correctness, from a particular case, a universal law for the historical development of the Theocracy, which he illustrates by that fact. He applies the same law to the Jews, considered as the special theocratic people in relation to the theocratic people formed from the mass of mankind by the gospel. Since those, who, according to the law of natural descent from the theocratic people, imagined that they had a sure title to admission into the kingdom of God, were yet excluded from it; on the contrary, by a dispensation of the divine Spirit, which could not have been calculated beforehand, towards the heathen nations, who according to the order of nature, since they were entirely distinct from the theocratic people, appeared to be altogether excluded* from the kingdom of God, a new theocratic race was called into existence, in whom the promises made to Abraham were to be fulfilled.

With respect to the second point, that of founding a claim for admission into the kingdom of God on the merits of a legal righteousness, Paul meets this arrogant assumption by the historical fact that the Jews, who by their zeal in the righteousness of the law, appeared to have the most valid title to such a privilege, were excluded from it on account of their unbelief; and on the contrary, the heathen, among whom there had been no such striving after a legal righteousness, were unexpectedly called to partake of it.

As in the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, he contemplates only this one aspect of the dispensation of divine grace in the perpetuation of the kingdom of God, and for a polemical purpose, it might seem as if he deemed the dispensation of divine grace to be in no respect affected by the determination of the human will—as if happiness and unhappiness were distributed among men by a divine predestination entirely unconditional; and as if he deduced the different conduct of men, in reference to the divine revelations and dispensations, from a divine causation which arranged everything according to an unchangeable necessity. This principle if carried out, would lead to a denial of all moral, free, self-determination in general, contradict the essence of genuine Theism, and would logically be consistent only with a Pantheistic view of the

* However improbable it appeared that Abraham would obtain offspring for the continuance of his race, in the manner which actually occurred, there was as little probability that the true worship of Jehovah would proceed from nations who had been hitherto devoted to idolatry.

world. But on such a supposition, the line of argument which Paul here adopts would be entirely inconsistent with the general design of this epistle. He wishes to prove both to Gentiles and Jews, that, owing to their sins, they had no means of exculpating themselves before the divine tribunal, that all were alike exposed to punishment; he particularly wished to lead the Jews to a conviction that, by their unbelief, they deserved exclusion from the kingdom of God. But on the hypothesis to which we have just referred, he would have removed all imputation of guilt, and furnished the best ground of excuse for all in a higher necessity that guided all human actions by an invisible thread. Or we must explain this scheme by the distinction of a twofold view, one theoretical, the other practical, a hidden and a revealed will of God; a distinction which we can find nothing in his mode of thinking to authorize. It is, moreover, evident from the close of his whole argument, which begins in the ninth chapter—even if we do not view this single discussion in its relation to the whole of his theology and anthropology—how very far he was from thinking of God as a being, who created the greater part of the human race in order to manifest his punitive justice to them after involving them in sin and unbelief; and who had created a smaller part in order to manifest his redeeming grace, by rescuing them from the sin into which they had been involved by a divine destiny; for he represents as the final issue of all the dispensations towards the generations of mankind, not such a partial, but the most general revelation of the divine grace. God hath suffered all, Jews as well as Gentiles,* to come to a knowledge of their sin, and thereby of their need of redemption, that he may manifest his redeeming grace to all who are in this way fitted to receive it, Rom. xi. 32. Moreover, the doxology with which he closes the whole exposition of his views (xi. 33) contains a twofold reference,—to the infinite wisdom of God, which manifests itself in the development of the kingdom of God among the Gentiles by an unexpected course of events,—and to the grace of God, to which men are indebted for all those blessings which no merits of their own could secure. Therefore, in the discussion which is closed by this doxology, there is only a reference to a divine wisdom, whose proceedings are not to be calculated beforehand, according to any contracted human theory; and to a superabounding grace of God, which anticipates all human merit, is all-controlling and in reference to which alone everything is to be understood. These two relations are closely connected with one another; for as the superabounding grace of God is shown by all, Jews as well as Gentiles, and Gentiles

* The great mass of mankind, as being either of Jewish or of Gentile extraction, seems to be the subject of discourse, rather than individuals; though, in Paul's sense, what he here says is applicable to the plan and course of the divine dealings with individuals; the same preparation for the appropriation of redemption is needed for individuals as for collective bodies consisting of individuals; the consciousness of the need of redemption is always the necessary intermediate step, though this may be awakened in various ways.

as well as Jews, being brought to a participation of redemption, so the wonderful wisdom of God is manifested by the manner in which, by the dealings of his providence with the nations, the feeling of the need of redemption as the necessary preparation for obtaining it, is developed in various ways among them, according to their respective positions and conditions.

Thus, too, Paul says in Eph. iii. 10, that by the manner in which the church of God was formed among mankind, and especially in which the heathen were led to a participation in redemption, the " manifold wisdom of God," *πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ*, was manifested; the epithet here given to the divine wisdom serving to express the variety of methods by which it conducted the development of mankind to one end. But the praise of the divine wisdom in this respect, is directly opposed to the hypothesis of an arbitrary impartation of grace and of an unconditional divine causation. For this very reason divine wisdom was requisite for the establishment of the church of God among mankind, because God did not at one stroke give that direction to men's minds which they required to attain to a participation in redemption, but trained them to it with free self-determination on their part according to their various degrees of enlightenment.*

In the discussion of this controversy, Paul gives prominence to this one point of view, the free grace and independent will of God, because his only object was to humble the pride of the Jews, and to awaken in their minds the consciousness that man, by all his efforts, cannot seize what he can only receive from the grace of God under a sense of his own dependence and need of help; that God was under no obligation to choose the instruments for perpetuating the Theocracy only from the members of the theocratic nation, but might make them the objects of punishment. But from this we are by no means to infer that Paul considered that this grace operated as a magical, unconditional necessity, or that the divine punishment was an arbitrary act, or, equally with sin and unbelief, a matter of divine causation. It was far from his intention to give a complete theory of the divine election of grace, and its relation to free-will, but only to exhibit it under that one special point of view, the absolute freedom of the divine act which could not have been foretold from any law of human calculation. It was therefore natural that, if

* When Paul speaks of the incomprehensibility of the divine dispensations towards the generations of men, it is in this sense, that the limited reason of man cannot determine *a priori* the proceedings of the divine government, and that man cannot understand its single acts till he can survey the connexion of the whole in its historical development. But since he speaks of a revelation of the divine wisdom, it is evident that he assumes that a knowledge of these dispensations is possible in such a connexion. And, in fact, the divine wisdom must have already manifested itself conspicuously in the transference of the kingdom of God from the Jews to the Gentiles, and in the preparation of the latter for that event, to those who only cast a glance at the events that were passing under their eyes. The divine wisdom will also be discerned at a future period, in the manner of bringing a larger body of the Jewish people to faith in the Redeemer.

this antithetical reference was not always kept in view, and everything else in connexion with it, many particulars would be misunderstood, and a very one-sided theory of election would be formed from this portion of Scripture. When Paul says God hardeneth whom he will, the freedom of the divine will in reference to the divine punishment is maintained against the delusion of the Jews, that their nation could not be an object of the divine displeasure. But that this punishment should be conditional, depending on the criminality of man as a free agent, is by no means excluded, but rather was naturally contained in the idea of *hardening*.

Through this idea *that* law of the moral world is indicated, according to which the moral self-determination gives its direction to the whole inward man; the sinful direction of the will brings on blindness of mind, and the manner in which everything from without operates on man, depends on this his inward self-determination, and by his consequent susceptibility or unsusceptibility for the revelation of the Divine which meets him from without. And in this respect, Paul holds up the example of Pharaoh as a warning to the Jewish nation. As to the miracles which, by another direction of his inward man, might have led him to an acknowledgment of the divine almightiness in the dealings of God with the Jewish people, and to a subjection of his will to the divine will clearly manifested to him—as these miracles on the contrary, only contributed to harden him in his self-will and delusion, so there was nothing to prevent God from acting in a similar way with the Jewish nation in reference to the reception they gave to the revelation of himself through Christ. When he says, that the Jews by all their efforts could attain nothing; but that the Gentiles, on the contrary, without such efforts had been admitted into the kingdom of God (Rom. ix. 30, 31); such language by no means implies that the conduct of men makes no difference in the impartation of grace, but exactly the contrary; for he thus expresses the hindrance to the reception of the gospel by the Jews arising from the direction of their minds, from the state of their hearts; namely, that a confidence in their own “willing and running” prevented the consciousness of their need of redemption, while those classes of heathens among whom the gospel was first propagated were more easily led to embrace it, because they indulged in no such false confidence. And as he combated the presumptuous dependence of the Jews on their own works and exposed its nullity, so on the other hand, he warned the Gentiles against a false dependence on divine grace, which might seduce them to a forgetfulness of what was required on their part in order to its appropriation. He represents the operations of grace as depending on their faithful retention on the part of man—the remaining in grace through the right direction of the will, Rom. xi. 20. “Because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith.” In another passage, Paul allows it to depend entirely on the direction of the will whether a man should become a vessel of honor or of dishonor. “If a man purge

himself from them, he still he a *remus* who *lives*. 2 Tim. ii. 25. But in his own sphere of action the Apostle was more frequently called to oppose a false confidence in a vain righteousness of works than a false confidence in divine grace; and his own course of preaching led him particularly to combat the former error. Both these circumstances together had the effect of disposing him to develop the Christian doctrine on this side especially, and to present what belonged to it in the clearest light.

Besides, when it was his object to arouse and establish the courage and confidence of believers, he could not direct them to the weak and uncertain power of man, but pointed to the immutable ground of confidence in the counsels of the divine love in reference to their salvation, the foundation of what God had effected through Christ. The divine counsel of salvation must necessarily be fulfilled in them, nor could the accomplishment of this unchangeable divine decree be prevented by anything which might happen to them in life; on the contrary, all things would serve to prepare for its accomplishment, everything which they might meet with in life must contribute to their salvation. This is the practical connexion of ideas in Rom. viii. 23, &c., "those whom God in his eternal intuition* has recognised as belonging to him through Christ, he has also predetermined should be conformed to the archetype of his Son, since he, having risen from the dead in his glorified humanity, should be the first-born among many brethren. But those whom he had predestined to this end, he has also called to it; those whom he has called, he has also justified; those whom he has justified, he has also glorified." The train of thought is therefore this: first, the divine idea of Christ, and of mankind contemplated in him; the divine counsel to realize this idea in believers, to conform them, as redeemed, to the archetype of Christ by the completion of the new creation. Then the gradual accomplishment of this counsel; first, the calling to believe, (in the Pauline sense, the outward and the inward call are conceived of as united in the production of faith); as believers they become justified, and with believing the realization of the dignity of the children of God begins in their inward life. That God gave up his Son in order to secure this blessing to them, is a sure pledge of their obtaining it, and that nothing which appears to stand in its way shall really obstruct, but on the contrary must serve to advance it. Consequently, this doctrine of a timeless, eternal predestination and election can by no possibility be removed from its connexion with the Pauline system; the supposition of a predestination conditioned by the divine prescience is un-Pauline; but by this doctrine nothing else is indicated than the application of the general purpose of God for the redemption of mankind through Christ as the ground of salvation to those in whom it is accom-

* I do not mean a knowledge simply resulting from the divine prescience, which is quite foreign to the connexion of the passage, but a creative knowledge, a law of being in the divine idea.

plished by virtue of their believing. The greatness and certainty of the dignity of Christians is thus evinced; but nothing whatever is determined by it respecting the relation of the divine choice to the free determination of the human will. When Paul, in Eph. i. 4, represents Christians as objects of the divine love before the foundation of the world, his object is to show that Christianity was not inferior to Judaism as a new dispensation, but was in fact the most ancient and original, and presupposed by Judaism itself; the election in Christ preceded the election of the Jewish nation in their forefathers; and redemption, the verification of the archetype of humanity through Christ and proceeding from him, is the end of the whole terrestrial creation, so that everything else appears as a preparation for this highest object in the counsel of creation in reference to this world. Paul here treats of an eternal election and predestination antecedent to the creation of the world, but not of an analogous reprobation, since the former, but not the latter, has an eternal, ideal basis. Reprobation relates only to a temporal appearance. Those in whom the divine idea fixed in Christ is not realized, appear precisely on this account as the excluded from its realization, in other words as the reprobate.*

Of the apostle Paul's views in reference to the last conflict which the kingdom of God will have to sustain, and his expectations of the victory to be gained by the approaching coming of the Lord, we have already spoken in our account of his ministry; *ante*, p. 200. The prospects of the consummation of the kingdom of God bear the same relation to the development of the New Testament dispensation, as the prophetic intimations of the glorification of the Theocracy by the work of the Redeemer bear to the development of the Old Testament dispensation. Everything prophetic must be fragmentary, and hence cannot furnish us with clear and connected knowledge. We cannot, therefore, help considering as a vain attempt, the endeavor to frame, by a comparison of particular apostolical expressions, a connected, complete doctrine of the Last Things. Indeed, from the position of the apostles, such a thing was not possible. It might indeed happen, that in moments of higher inspiration and of special illumination, many higher but still isolated views might be imparted, which they were not yet to combine into an organic, systematic unity with their other eschatological representations.

With the doctrine of the consummation of the Kingdom of God, is closely connected, in the Pauline system, the doctrine of the Resurrection. This doctrine does not present itself here as something accidental and isolated, but stands in intimate relation to his whole mode of contemplating the Christian life. It is the fundamental view of Paul and of the New Testament generally, that the Christian life, which proceeds from faith carries in it the germ of a higher futurity; that the development

* Employing the scholastic terminology in a Pauline sense, we may say that the *voluntas signi*, not the *voluntas beneplaciti*, is here pointed out.

himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honor, 2 Tim. ii. 21. But in his own sphere of action, the Apostle was more frequently called to oppose a false confidence in a vain righteousness of works, than a false confidence in divine grace; and his own course of education led him particularly to combat the former error. Both these circumstances together had the effect of disposing him to develop the Christian doctrine on this side especially, and to present what belonged to it in the clearest light.

Besides, when it was his object to arouse and establish the courage and confidence of believers, he could not direct them to the weak and uncertain power of man, but pointed to the immovable ground of confidence in the counsels of the divine love in reference to their salvation, the foundation of what God had effected through Christ. The divine counsel of salvation must necessarily be fulfilled in them, nor could the accomplishment of this unchangeable divine decree be prevented by anything which might happen to them in life; on the contrary, all things would serve to prepare for its accomplishment, everything which they might meet with in life must contribute to their salvation. This is the practical connexion of ideas in Rom. viii. 28, &c., "those whom God in his eternal intuition* has recognised as belonging to him through Christ, he has also predetermined should be conformed to the archetype of his Son, since he, having risen from the dead in his glorified humanity, should be the first-born among many brethren. But those whom he had predestined to this end, he has also called to it; those whom he has called, he has also justified; those whom he has justified, he has also glorified." The train of thought is therefore this: first, the divine idea of Christ, and of mankind contemplated in him; the divine counsel to realize this idea in believers, to conform them, as redeemed, to the archetype of Christ by the completion of the new creation. Then the gradual accomplishment of this counsel; first, the calling to believe, (in the Pauline sense, the outward and the inward call are conceived of as united in the production of faith); as believers they become justified, and with believing the realization of the dignity of the children of God begins in their inward life. That God gave up his Son in order to secure this blessing to them, is a sure pledge of their obtaining it, and that nothing which appears to stand in its way shall really obstruct, but on the contrary must serve to advance it. Consequently, this doctrine of a timeless, eternal predestination and election can by no possibility be removed from its connexion with the Pauline system; the supposition of a predestination conditioned by the divine prescience is un-Pauline; but by this doctrine nothing else is indicated than the application of the general purpose of God for the redemption of mankind through Christ as the ground of salvation to those in whom it is accom-

* I do not mean a knowledge simply resulting from the divine prescience, which is quite foreign to the connexion of the passage, but a creative knowledge, a law of being in the divine idea.

doctrine, and with the Christian system generally, with the *of the world*, κληρονομία τοῦ κόσμου, which promises to be they shall reign with Christ—that to them as to Christ all future world shall be subject—that this globe is destined to of the triumphant kingdom of God—that in its progressive this kingdom will subject all things to itself, until the con- of its dominion over the world which Paul marks as the aim ~~personal~~ longing.

ly connects the doctrine of the eternal life of the individual with of the resurrection, and says nothing of the life of the soul in ~~mediate~~ state after death till the end of all things. The designation a sleep in relation to the resurrection that is to follow, may opinion that he considered the state after death to be one of consciousness like sleep, and admitted that the soul would awakened at the resurrection of the body, though in every other to death he could describe it under the image of sleep as a to a higher existence. When in the church at Thessalonica es of many were excited respecting the fate of the believers already died, he only intimates to them that, at the time of ~~second~~ coming, the believers then alive would have no advantage those who were already dead. But it might be supposed, that mitted a continuance of consciousness in more exalted and in- union with the Lord as taking place immediately after would have reminded the persons whose minds were disturbed ject, that those for whom they mourned had already been ad- a higher and blessed communion with their Lord, as a later the Church would not have failed to do.

ice Paul was convinced that by faith men pass from death unto e he testified from his own experience under manifold suffer-

ething strictly peculiar to that age, and not as having existed up to that moment ~~inning~~, ever since the creation had been subject to this bondage. 3. Accord- m ideas, he could not say that the world against its will was subjected, in a from blame, by God himself to the bondage of a vain existence. 4. Accord- terpretation, Paul must have taught, that as soon as the children of God had - destined glory, this glory would spread itself over the heathen world, which nter into the communion of the divine life. But if it be assumed that Paul here l clearly expressed the doctrine of a universal restitution, and presupposed it as own, he must first have mentioned the appropriation of redemption by faith f salvation equally necessary for all; he could not have admitted the possi- a state of glorification not brought about through faith in the Redeemer.

hough he has not expressed this in precisely the same terms as John, yet the expressed follows of course from what he has repeatedly asserted respecting om spiritual death, and the making alive by faith. Between the two apostles a difference of form, not of the use they make of the idea of "life," ζῶν,— ey agree, in considering it as something that really enters the soul with at John refers the idea of "eternal life," ζωή αἰώνιος, to the present, Paul ature, although both thoroughly agree in the recognition of the divine life

of the divine life begun by faith, through which a man appropriates the redeeming work of Christ and enters into fellowship with him, will go on until it has pervaded human nature in its full extent. Thus the appropriation of the body as an organ for the sanctified soul, as a temple of the Holy Spirit, must prepare it for that higher state in which, glorified, it will be presented as the thoroughly corresponding organ of the perfected holy soul, Rom. vi. 5-8, 11; 1 Cor. vi. 14. Expositors, for want of entering sufficiently into the profound views of the apostle, and of grasping the comprehensive survey that stretches from the present into the future, have often erred by a mistaken reference of such passages either solely to the spiritual resurrection of the present state, or solely to the bodily resurrection of the future.

The difficulties which were raised, even in the apostle's time, respecting the doctrine of the resurrection (see above), were founded particularly on the gross sensuous conceptions of it, and on the customary mode of determining the identity of the body. Paul, on the contrary, in the fifteenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, teaches that, by the same creative power of God which caused a peculiar creation to proceed from a grain of corn, an organ of the soul adapted to its higher condition would be formed from an indestructible corporeal germ. It may be asked, what is the essence of the body considered as an organ belonging to a distinct personality? As such it is to be clearly distinguished from that sensuous visible form which, perpetually changing in itself, is also perishable. The former, as something belonging to the representation of the whole personality, will be restored in a form corresponding to its glorified state. And as the body of man is the mediating organ between the soul and nature, the idea of a Palingenesis of the latter is here associated with the resurrection, as is done by Paul in Rom. viii. 19-23.* This idea stands in close connexion with the whole of the Paul-

* The later distinguished commentators on this epistle have acknowledged this to be the only tenable exposition; and even Usteri, who had before brought forward the strongest objections against it, has been induced, for the same reasons which appear to me convincing, to accede to it. (See the last edition of his *Paulinischen Lehrbegriffe*, and in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1832, part iv.) Against that interpretation, according to which this passage refers to the anxiety of the heathen world, the following reasons appear to me decisive. 1. Paul would in that case have used, as he generally does, the word "world," *κόσμος*. 2. If we admit that he here pointed out the deeply felt sense of universal misery, the feeling of dissatisfaction with all existing things, the longing after something better, though without a clear knowledge of the object desired; if we admit that, out of his own Christian consciousness, he pointed this feeling to something unknown to those whom this feeling pervaded; yet he could in that case attribute such feelings to only a small and better part of the world; it is impossible that he could assert this of the whole mass of the heathen world sunk in sin. Yet we must grant that, in describing an age of great excitement, and pervaded by a vague and obscure anxiety, it might be said, that an anxiety of which they were unconscious was at the bottom of their wrestling and striving,—that they were in a state of unhappiness, which only he who had attained a higher knowledge could explain to them; and thus Paul might apply the expressions used by him to describe the spiritual condition of the world around him. But then, he must have described this state of men's

ine scheme of doctrine, and with the Christian system generally, with the *inheritance of the world*, κληρονομία τοῦ κόσμου, which promises to believers that they shall reign with Christ—that to them as to Christ all things in the future world shall be subject—that this globe is destined to be the scene of the triumphant kingdom of God—that in its progressive development this kingdom will subject all things to itself, until the consummation of its dominion over the world which Paul marks as the aim of this universal longing.

He usually connects the doctrine of the eternal life of the individual with the doctrine of the resurrection, and says nothing of the life of the soul in an intermediate state after death till the end of all things. The designation of death as a sleep in relation to the resurrection that is to follow, may favor the opinion that he considered the state after death to be one of suppressed consciousness like sleep, and admitted that the soul would first be awakened at the resurrection of the body, though in every other reference to death he could describe it under the image of sleep as a transition to a higher existence. When in the church at Thessalonica the anxieties of many were excited respecting the fate of the believers who had already died, he only intimates to them that, at the time of Christ's second coming, the believers then alive would have no advantage over those who were already dead. But it might be supposed, that had he admitted a continuance of consciousness in more exalted and intimate communion with the Lord as taking place immediately after death, he would have reminded the persons whose minds were disturbed on the subject, that those for whom they mourned had already been admitted to a higher and blessed communion with their Lord, as a later Father in the Church would not have failed to do.

Yet since Paul was convinced that by faith men pass from death unto life*—since he testified from his own experience under manifold suffer-

minds as something strictly peculiar to that age, and not as having existed up to that moment from the beginning, ever since the creation had been subject to this bondage. 3. According to his own ideas, he could not say that the world against its will was subjected, in a manner free from blame, by God himself to the bondage of a vain existence. 4. According to this interpretation, Paul must have taught, that as soon as the children of God had attained their destined glory, this glory would spread itself over the heathen world, which would then enter into the communion of the divine life. But if it be assumed that Paul here so openly and clearly expressed the doctrine of a universal restitution, and presupposed it as something known, he must first have mentioned the appropriation of redemption by faith as a means of salvation equally necessary for all; he could not have admitted the possibility of such a state of glorification not brought about through faith in the Redeemer.

* For although he has not expressed this in precisely the same terms as John, yet the thought here expressed follows of course from what he has repeatedly asserted respecting deliverance from spiritual death, and the making alive by faith. Between the two apostles there is only a difference of form, not of the use they make of the idea of "life," ζωή,—for in this they agree, in considering it as something that really enters the soul with believing; but John refers the idea of "eternal life," ζωὴ αἰώνιος, to the present, Paul only to the future, although both thoroughly agree in the recognition of the divine life

ings, that while the outward man perished, the inward was renewed day by day, 2 Cor. iv. 16, and since this experience was to him a type of the future, that the outward man will only pass to a higher life from the final dissolution of death—since he received a progressive development of the divine life in communion with the Redeemer—since he taught that believers will follow the Saviour in all things—from all these considerations it necessarily followed, that the higher life of believers can not be interrupted by death, and that by means of it they may attain to a more complete participation in Christ's divine and blessed life. This idea of a progressive development of the divine life in communion with the Redeemer, is indeed not a foreign element introduced into the doctrine of the Apostle, but proceeds from his own peculiar mode of contemplation, as we learn from a comparison of his language in numberless passages. True, we are not sufficiently justified to conclude from that idea of such a process of development in the earthly life, that Paul believed in its progression after the close of our earthly life, in the period intervening till the resurrection. We may imagine the possibility that the consequences flowing from those premises would not be consciously developed by him, since the thoughts of the resurrection and everlasting life were in his mind so closely connected that he would be induced to leave the interval between the death of believers and their resurrection as an empty space. But, in the Epistle to the Romans, viii. 10, Paul expressly makes this distinction between the soul and the body, that the latter will die, and be given up to death on account of sin, the germ of which it carries in itself, but the former will by means of the life of its indwelling righteousness be exalted above death, so that death will have no power over it; accordingly, their life will be exposed to no repression or destruction, but be in a state of progressive development never again to be interrupted by death. And the conclusion which we may draw from this single passage, is confirmed by those passages in the later Pauline epistles, which intimate that higher degrees of communion with Christ and of happiness are immediately consequent on death. The admission of this fact is by no means contradicted by his representing that the last and greatest result in the consummation of the kingdom of God, will proceed, not from its natural spontaneous development, but from without by the immediate event of Christ's final coming; as, in the same manner, the facts of the appearance of the Son of God in humanity, redemption, and regeneration, though they are not deduced from a preceding development, and constitute a perfectly new era in the spiritual life, are far from excluding, but rather presuppose, an antecedent preparatory development. Now, the later epistles of Paul contain such passages, in which he expresses most decidedly the hope of a higher development immediately consequent on death, of a divine life of blessedness in more complete communion with

founded in faith, which bears in it the germ of a future higher development, anticipates the future, and contains it in itself as in bud.

Christ; Philip. i. 21, 23. We cannot in truth perceive how Paul, if he supposed the second coming of Christ and the resurrection to be events so very near, could say, that he “desired to depart and to be with Christ which is far better,” in case he placed the salutary consequences of death only in something negative—in freedom from the toils and conflicts of earthly life, under which, as he so often declared, he experienced so much more intensely the blessed effects of the gospel on his own soul,—and had not contemplated a higher kind of presence with Christ, a higher development of the life which was rooted in communion with him as a consequence of death. Must not a man of Paul’s flaming zeal and holy activity have preferred such a life of conflict for the kingdom of Christ, to a slumbering and dreaming existence or a life of shadows? In 2 Tim. iv. 18, he also describes an entrance into the kingdom of Christ as immediately following death; though this last passage is not so decisive, as the interpretation in this point of view may be disputed.*

It may perhaps be thought† that a progress on this subject in the development of Christian knowledge took place in Paul’s mind. As long as he expected the second coming of Christ and the final resurrection as very near at hand, he had little occasion to separate from one another the ideas of an eternal life after death and of a resurrection; and, in accordance with the Jewish habits of thinking, he blended them together in a manner that led to the idea of a certain sleep of the soul after death. But when, by the course of events and the signs of the times, he had learned to form clearer notions of the future, and when he was induced to think that the last decisive epoch was not so very near (as appears from his later epistles), the idea of a higher condition of happiness beginning immediately after death must have developed itself in his mind, under the illumination of the Divine Spirit, from the consciousness of the divine life as exalted above death, and as perpetually progressing, and from the consciousness of unbroken communion with the Redeemer as the Divine fountain of life. The illumination of the Apostles’ minds by the Holy Spirit was surely not completed at once; but was the operation of a higher inciting power that possessed a creative fertility, and under whose influences their Christian knowledge and thinking progressively developed, by means of higher revelations which were not violently forced upon them, but coalesced in a natural manner with their psychological development.‡ As Peter, through the illumination of the divine Spirit at precisely that point of time in his ministry where it was required, came to understand that the Gentiles, through faith alone in the Redeemer, should be incorporated into the kingdom of God, so could it

* The noticeable remarks by repetent Weizel of Tübingen, in his essay on the original Christian doctrine of Immortality, in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1836, Part iv., have not occasioned any alteration in my views on this subject.

† This seems to be the view taken by Usteri.

‡ See above, p. 66.

also happen with Paul that he should be led to a more perfect understanding of the truth exactly at that point of time when it was required for his own religious necessities and those of future generations. But it is against this supposition that, in the fifteenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, he expresses himself on death and the resurrection, in the same manner as in the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, and yet we find in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians written some months later, a confident expectation expressed, that a life of a higher kind in communion with Christ would immediately succeed the dissolution of earthly existence; for it is impossible to understand 2 Cor. v. 6-8 in a different sense, where Paul marks as correlative ideas, on the one hand, the remaining in the earthly body and being absent from the Lord (a want of that higher immediate communion with him which would belong to an existence in the other world), a condition in which we live by faith; and, on the other hand, the departure from earthly life, and being admitted to the immediate presence of the Lord, and to an intimate communion with him no longer concealed under the veil of faith. How could he have described what he longed for, as a departure from this earthly life and a being present with the Lord, if he intended to describe that change which would arise from the final coming of Christ, from his coming to believers? We also find in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, the same views presented as in the Epistle to the Philippians; yet it is not probable that in the few months between the time of his writing the First and the Second Epistles to the Corinthians, such a revolution had taken place in his mode of thinking on this subject. From a comparison of the First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians, we may therefore conclude that Paul, even when, in his earlier statements respecting the resurrection, he said nothing of the state of the souls of individual believers in the interval between death and the resurrection, though the uninterrupted development of a higher life after death is not excluded by him. We must then suppose, either that he did not particularly bring this thought forward, because he was accustomed to found all the hopes of believers on the resurrection of Christ, and to connect them with the doctrine of the resurrection, because also he thought that last great event so nigh, and was so constantly turning his attention to it; or that he had not directed his thoughts to the time that intervenes between death and the resurrection. But as he became aware that the period of the consummation of the kingdom of God was not so nigh as he had formerly anticipated, he was induced to bring forward more distinctly a subject which had hitherto been kept in the background. We discern in Paul a progressive knowledge of Eschatology generally, as it grew up under the enlightening and guiding influence of the Holy Spirit, when we compare his Epistles to the Thessalonians with his later ones, the lifting up of believers to an ever-enduring fellowship with the Lord, 1 Thess. iv. 17, with the later developed doctrine of a glorified

earth as the seat of the perfected kingdom of God; and 2 Thess. i. 7-9, with the doctrine of a final restitution announced at a later period.

Paul represents as the ultimate object of his hopes, the complete victory of the kingdom of God over all the evil which had hitherto prevented its realization, over everything which checked and obscured the development of the divine life. Believers, in their complete personality transformed and placed beyond the reach of death, will perfectly reflect the image of Christ, and be introduced into the perfect communion of his divine, holy, blessed, and unchangeable life. The perfected kingdom of God among mankind will then blend itself harmoniously with all the other forms of divine manifestation throughout his infinite dominions. Inspired by the prospect of this last triumph of redemption, when sin with all its consequences, death and all evil, shall be entirely overcome, in the certain knowledge of the victory already won by Christ, the pledge of all that will follow, Paul exclaims (1 Cor. xv. 55-58), "Where, Death, is now thy sting? (Death has now lost its power to wound the redeemed from sin, since they are already conscious of an eternal divine life.) Where, Grave, is thy victory? (the victory which the kingdom of death gained through sin.) But the sting of death is sin; that which causes the power of sin to be felt is the law. (What the law could not do, which made us first feel the power of sin in its whole extent, Christ has accomplished by redeeming us from sin and thus from death.) But God be thanked, who hath given us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." Inasmuch, now, as by the kingdom of Christ is to be understood a mediatorial dispensation founded specially in redemption, a dispensation in which the universal kingdom of God, overcoming the kingdom of evil, shall be carried forward to a perfect realization of all that in principle is involved in redemption, this kingdom of Christ, designed to take the special form given to it, when it shall have reached its appointed goal, when, through the efficiency of the glorified Christ, it shall have been carried to that point where it will have no more opposition to encounter and will no longer need a Redeemer and Mediator, will come to an end. Then will God himself in an immediate manner work all things in those who through Christ have attained to perfect communion with him, who are freed from everything that opposed the divine operation in their souls, and who have been transformed into undimmed organs of God, for whose glory all things shall serve. The mediatorial kingdom of God will then merge into the immediatorial. Such is the declaration of Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 27, 28.

It is one of the greatest of errors when that which Paul designates as the final limit of a future development, is pantheistically conceived of, in falsely applied conceptions of an age of the Holy Spirit, as a limit of the present earthly development lying beyond Christianity. Never will there be a development free from sin on earth—never a development which may have outgrown the need of redemption, which may have transcended Christ and Christianity.

But if we understand in the strictest sense of the words, what is said in that passage of the universal subjection and conquest of all the enemies of God's kingdom, it would follow, that all subjective opposition to the will of God will then cease, and that a perfect union of the will of the creature with that of the Creator will universally prevail. This will necessarily be the case, if we understand the words, v. 28, "that God may be all in all,"* in absolute universality; for then it would follow, that the kingdom of God is to be realized subjectively in all rational creatures, and that nothing ungodlike will any longer exist. Then would be fulfilled, in the most complete sense, what Paul expresses in Rom. xi. 32. But though this interpretation is in itself possible, and founded on the words, still we are not sufficiently justified by the connexion to understand the expression in an unlimited sense. If that subjection were to be understood as only objective and compulsory, it might be affirmed that the enemies of God's kingdom will have no more power to undertake anything against it, that they will no longer be able to exert a disturbing influence on its development. By the "all," *πᾶσι*, in whom God will be "all," *τὰ πάντα*, we may understand merely believers, as in v. 22 by "all," *πάντες*,† those who enter by faith into communion with Christ; and it certainly appears from the connexion to be Paul's design only to represent what belongs to the perfect realization of Christ's work for believers.

Yet this does not forbid our supposing that the spirit of Paul, comprehending all things to the last closing point of the development of redemption and salvation in one vast contemplation, might have raised itself above the limits of the proposition lying immediately before him, and taken in the final result, which would resolve all disharmony into perfect unison. And it would be the most natural construction to suppose an interval between what is stated in 1 Cor. xv. 23, and in the following verse, and in this interval those developments might take place which would contribute to bring on the last end of universal restoration: first of all, the resurrection and perfect blessedness of believers; and then the general resurrection of all, freed from sin, transfigured to a divine life, when God shall be all in all. But it is worthy of notice how immediately Paul comes to the "then," *εἰτα*. It appears that here he wished rather to intimate than to express and develop.

The words in Philip. ii. 10, 11, may indeed be supposed to mean, that all rational beings are to be subjected to the Redeemer as their Lord, although this will not be accomplished with respect to all in the same manner; in some there may be a subjective, hearty, free obedience, in others only what is outward and compulsory, the obedience of impotence, which can effect nothing against the kingdom of Christ.—Meanwhile the

* *πᾶσιν* may be taken either as masculine or neuter.

† If the emphasis be laid, not on the *πάντες*, but on the *ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ*,—that here everything proceeds from Christ, as on the other side from Adam.

question arises, whether in the words "bow the knee at the name of Christ, and confess that he is Lord to the glory of God," something more is not meant than a description of such forced, outward obedience, if we understand these words according to the Pauline use of terms.* We should interpret the passage in Coloss. i. 20 in the simplest and most natural manner, if we could admit such a reference to the reconciling and redeeming work of Christ on the fallen spiritual world. And we could then combine in one view the three passages, and interpret them by a mutual comparison. We should thus recognise a magnificent prospect of the final triumph of the work of redemption, a prospect which rose before the mind of the great Apostle only in the last stage of his Christian development, when his conceptions had been progressively clarified by means of that love which impelled him to sacrifice himself for the salvation of mankind. At all events, we find here only some slight intimations, and we recognize the guidance of divine wisdom, that in the records of revelation destined for such various steps of religious development, no more light has been communicated on this subject.

CHAPTER II.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

WE wish here to glance at that type of doctrine peculiar to the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in whom we find the leading points of the Pauline doctrine under a peculiar form, as held by a man of independent mind, who differed from Paul in his constitutional qualities, in his mental training, and in the mode of his transition from Judaism to Christianity. As to the first point, the author of this Epistle seems to stand to the apostle in the same relation as Melancthon to Luther; the one quiet and gentle, the other ardent and energetic. As to their education, Paul was brought up in the school of Pharisaism; in the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, we recognise the training of an Alexandrian Jew. Hence arose the difference between the two, that Paul received a more dialectic education, by which his logical faculties were still further developed, and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews a more rhetorical one; though Paul, like Luther, possessed in a

* The doctrine of such a universal restitution would not stand in contradiction to the doctrine of eternal punishment, as the latter appears in the Gospels; for although those who are hardened in wickedness, left to the consequences of their conduct, their merited fate, have to expect endless unhappiness, yet a hidden purpose of the divine compassion is not necessarily excluded, by virtue of which, through the wisdom of God revealing itself in the discipline of free agents, they will be led to a free appropriation of redemption.

very high degree the gift of natural eloquence. Lastly, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews appears to have made the transition from Judaism to Christianity, not, like Paul, by a sudden crisis, but by a more quiet, gradual development, in which the higher spirit concealed under the forms of Judaism revealed itself to him. Accordingly, we must consider his twofold relation to the Alexandrian-Jewish and to the Pauline theology. Several differences in the development of doctrine between these two great teachers of the church, may be explained from the peculiar design of this Epistle, which was addressed to a community of Christians, who, though faith in Jesus as the Messiah had found ready acceptance with them, were still enthralled in the forms of Judaism.*

* This view we must maintain, notwithstanding the reasons alleged against it by Dr. Rôth in his Latin Dissertation (Frankfort, 1836), in which he endeavors to show that this epistle was addressed to the church at Ephesus, consisting of Gentile Christians. As the epistle perfectly suits a church consisting of Jewish Christians, and the difficulties attached to this hypothesis are only superficial, so we cannot, on the other hand, conceive of a church of Gentile Christians to whom an epistle could be addressed in such a form and of such contents. And, on the latter supposition, it would not be easy to explain the manifestly close connexion of the didactic and parenetical elements from its commencement, since a church consisting of Gentile Christians might be forced by persecution to fall back into Heathenism, but never from such a cause, to pass over to Judaism. The contents of this epistle, which tend to show the superiority of Christianity to Judaism, would therefore by no means be adapted to the purpose of encouraging its readers to constancy under persecutions. Dr. Rôth appeals to chap. iii. 12; but apostasy from the living God need not be exactly a relapse into idolatry, for as communion with God, according to the convictions of the writer, could only be through Christ, so an apostasy from Christ must in his esteem have been equivalent to apostasy from the living God. Still less can the passage in chap. x. 32 be adduced in evidence, for doubtless divine illumination appeared to the author as necessarily depending on the gospel; and a transition from any other religious position, in which men could not be set free from the dominion of the principle of sin, was looked upon by him as a transition from darkness to light. The same remark applies to chap. vi. 4. Also, the enumeration of points of instruction for catechumens in chap. vi. 1, does not prove that they were only such as would be imparted to heathens; for by "repentance from dead works," the author no doubt understands conversion from all ungodliness, and by *πίστις* in this connexion, agreeably to the Pauline ideas, he meant faith in the peculiarly Christian sense; so that faith in Jesus as the Messiah is included in it, which in articles of instruction for heathens must also, we allow, have been rendered very prominent. Besides, for the instruction of Jews passing over to Christianity, it was requisite to explain the nature of Christian baptism, in relation to that of John and other kinds of lustration; and the doctrine of the resurrection and of the judgment, though already acknowledged by the greater part of the Jews, must in its connexion with the doctrine of Jesus as the Messiah, be promulgated afresh with many peculiar modifications. Thus the author enumerates those universal articles of primary religious instruction, which needed to be addressed to Jews as well as to Gentiles. From chap. xiii. 9, it does not follow that his readers had never before observed the Jewish laws relating to food, and therefore were not Jews, but only, that according to the supposition of the writer of the epistle, they no longer as Christians placed their dependence on such outward things. At all events, by "the divers and strange doctrines," some peculiar opinions must be understood which were placed by the false teachers in connexion with the Jewish laws on food. The passage in chap. xi. 40, can only be intended to mark a later generation (in this case no matter whether of Jewish or Gentile descent), which had not yet come into existence, and

Paul and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews agree in this, that they both represent Judaism as inadequate for satisfying the religious wants of man. This is the purport of what is said in chap. vii. 19, that Judaism could "make nothing perfect;" its religious institutions were not fitted to realize the ideas presented by them to the conscience; the sacrifices and the priesthood were unable to satisfy that religious want, to which both owed their existence; namely, to accomplish the removal of the disunion between God and man. Those religious ideas were here represented in sensible images, which were first realized by Christianity. Both Paul and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, place the central point of religion in redemption from guilt and sin, the restoration of communion with God, whence proceeds the impartation of a divine life, the source of true holiness; and the inability of Judaism to attain this object formed, in the estimation of both, its essential defect. In this Epistle (viii. 12; vi. 4; ix. 15) the forgiveness of sins, the communication of a new divine life, of divine power for sanctification, are described as the work of Christ—as the effect of Christianity; it is maintained, that by this new principle of life, the redeemed are able to render true spiritual worship, which comprehends the whole life, so that now the whole soul, animated by a new spirit, becomes a thank-offering for the grace of redemption bestowed upon it (xii. 28; ix. 14; xiii. 15); and in the same manner Paul contemplates the whole Christian life as true spiritual worship.

But these two writers differ in their manner of carrying out the fundamental ideas which they hold in common. Paul, in opposition to the merit of works as regarded in the light of the law, and especially against the tenet that an observance of the law was absolutely necessary for the Gentiles in order to salvation—develops his doctrine of justification by faith alone, independently of the works of the law. This doctrine that no one could become righteous before God by the observance of the law, but only through faith in Jesus as the Messiah and Redeemer, lies also at the basis of the Epistle to the Hebrews. But since the author of this epistle directs his argumentation especially against those who were still captivated by the pomp of the Temple worship, the priesthood and the sacrifices, and were in danger of being entirely seduced from Christianity by the impression these objects made upon them, this gave a peculiar direction to his reasoning, and it aimed at showing that by all this ritual their religious wants could not be satisfied, but that its only

therefore would not have attained to a participation in the Messianic kingdom, if this kingdom had commenced earlier, and thus the development of the human race had been sooner closed. According to Dr. Röh's interpretation, it would also have been necessary for the author to have addressed his readers in the second person, for the rhetorical figure *Anakoinosis* would have been as inapplicable in the epistle generally, on the supposition that its author was of Jewish descent, as it would be in chap. ii. 3, on the supposition that Paul was its author.

use was to direct them to the sole true means of satisfaction. As Paul declared that the law could not bestow the justification which man required, but that it only awakened that feeling of want which nothing but faith in Jesus as the Redeemer could satisfy, so in the Epistle to the Hebrews it is shown, that the mediation required by man's relation to God and heaven, could not be effected by the Jewish priesthood, but that it only availed to call forth a longing for such a mediation, and thus to point to Him who alone could bestow it.

But in one respect an opposition may seem to exist between the Pauline views and the doctrinal scheme of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Paul contemplates Judaism as abolished. Everything in religion is represented as proceeding from faith in Christ alone; in receiving the gospel a man is in effect dead to his former religious position; whatever was before the ground of his confidence, now appears to him as an absolute nullity. On the contrary, according to the views presented in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the whole Jewish cultus is, it is true, only a shadowy image of something superior; but the writer considers it as still continuing to exist till everything earthly, and consequently this form of earthly worship, shall come to an end, when the Messianic kingdom being consummated, a higher order of things shall succeed. Thus we may here meet with a view, which was peculiar to the original Jewish-Christian belief generally, that the communion with the sanctuary of heaven bestowed by Christianity, would be carried on in this world in combination with the forms of a cultus which typified heavenly things; that a new higher spirit would continue to operate in the ancient forms of religion. But still this is only an apparent contradiction between the two great teachers; for it is evident from the train of thought in this epistle, that the writer looked on the Jewish cultus as entirely superfluous, since it can contribute nothing whatever towards effecting communion with heaven and reconciliation with God, on which everything depends. But since Christianity effects all this, since it bestows everything demanded by the religious wants of man, what need can there be of another cultus?

If, in connexion with such views, the Jewish cultus could still find a place, the only point of junction could be, the representation that the conscientious observance of all that belonged to the Mosaic cultus, would be a preparatory purifying and sanctifying process, to qualify for the participation of divine things through the medium of Christianity. This was the position from which Philo, in his work *De Migratione Abrahami*, combats a religious idealism which would have explained away the whole of outward Judaism as superfluous. But in this epistle we can find no trace of attributing such a continual preparatory utility to Judaism; according to its fundamental ideas, connexion with Christ as the true high-priest renders superfluous all other methods of purification and sanctification. If the author of this epistle had some notion that these outward forms of Judaism, whose design was only prepara-

tive and typical, would linger in existence till the whole terrestrial economy would be terminated by the second advent of Christ at no very distant period, it by no means follows that he considered these forms as of essential importance. We must only bear in mind in what light the author viewed the relation of the present to the future. This relation was the same in his conceptions as in Paul's. To Christians the future is by faith already become present. They ascend with the confidence of faith into the holiest of holies in heaven, which Christ has rendered accessible to them; x. 22. They already belong to the heavenly Jerusalem, and are become the associates of angels; xii. 23. They have already been made partakers of an eternal, unchangeable kingdom; xii. 28. They have already felt the powers of the world to come. Hence it follows, that, as they no more belong in their inward life to this transitory world, but to the higher future world, they are actually raised entirely above the conceptions of Judaism. When in ix. 9, it is said, that, in the "time then present," *καιρὸς ἐνεστηκὼς* (equivalent to "this world," *αἰὼν οὗτος*), there is a sacrificial worship, which yet, like all such outward things, cannot bestow* the right constitution of the inner life, the *purification* from guilt, which man requires in order to become a member of God's kingdom, it must be recollected that Christians do not belong to "this world," *αἰὼν οὗτος*, but to the "world to come," *αἰὼν μέλλων*, and hence all this is nothing to them. When the author speaks of outward ordinances,† ix. 10, which were "imposed until the time of reformation," it is added, that the "reformation," *διόρθωσις*, emanates from Christ,‡ and has been entered upon through Him who has freed us from the yoke of these old ordinances, though in its whole extent it will first take effect in the "world to come," *οἰκουμένη μελλοῦσα*. In fact, he contrasts with the Jews who serve an earthly sanctuary (xiii. 10) the Christians to whom the altar in heaven stands open, while it is closed against the Jews who cleave to an earthly sanctuary. This is the contrast between those whose worship still adheres to the veil of outward, sensible forms, and those who rise at once to heaven. As Jesus suffered without the gates of Jerusalem, so, according to the symbolical representations employed in this epistle, must those who desire to belong to him withdraw themselves from the terrestrial Jerusalem, the earthly sanctuary, as from this world in general; xiii. 13. We here find the same principles as in Paul's writings. The author of this epistle does not, indeed, argue directly against the maintenance of the outward forms of the Jewish cultus, nor does he demand their abolition; but this even Paul would not have done in an epistle addressed to Christians who belonged to Judaism by national descent and education.

* Paul would have said that all this could contribute nothing to their *justification*.

† The same which Paul asserts of the *σαρκικὰ τοῦ νόμου*, of the being in subjection to the *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*. See p. 426, *note*.

‡ As the contrast in ver. 11 shows.

It may appear as rather un-Pauline that he treats only of the salvation of those who belonged to the posterity of Abraham, and of Christ's relation to such. We may indeed doubt, whether Paul, if he had been writing to a church composed entirely of Jewish Christians, could have so far restrained himself, as not to have dropped some expressions on a subject which so deeply interested him as the divine purpose to incorporate the Gentiles with the Jews in the kingdom of God by faith in the Redeemer ; and whether he would not have felt compelled to have adverted, at least in an apologetic manner, to his peculiar vocation as a preacher of the gospel among the Gentiles. Yet it is certain that a writer who so expressed himself respecting the conditions of admission into the Messianic kingdom and on the relation of Judaism to the work of Christ, as we find to be the case in this epistle, must have agreed with the Pauline doctrine in thinking, that as the attainment of eternal salvation was independent of Judaism and determined alone by faith in Christ, therefore by the fulfilment of this one condition it was attainable by all men. We also find that he selects as a type of Christ, not one of the family of Abraham, but Melchisedec—an indication of Messianic universalism. If we call to mind that he considers the "people," λαός, as a representative of the theocratic people in general, the posterity of Abraham as representatives of those of the human family in general who are destined for the kingdom of God, we shall not be able to detect any contradiction between himself and Paul.

With respect to the work of Christ, the author of this epistle appears to differ from Paul, in not bringing forward the resurrection as a seal of the redemption effected by the Saviour in the same way as that apostle. But it is not difficult to perceive, that the same conception of the resurrection in relation to the whole of the Christian system lies at the basis of this epistle. There is the same connexion between sin and death presupposed, as, for instance, when it is said in ii. 14, that Satan had the power over death, that is, that death was not an original element in the creation, but was first occasioned by Satan, by means of sin which is the work of Satan, and being thus connected with sin, belongs to Satan's kingdom. In the same sense as Paul intends, sin is also considered as the sting of death ; for it is said that men oppressed by a consciousness of guilt are kept in continual bondage through the fear of death,—*that* fear of death, which presents itself in connexion with the divine judgment to the agonizing conscience as something so terrible, and which blasts the cheerful enjoyment of life. When it is affirmed that Christ through death destroyed the kingdom of Satan, who had power over death, and thereby freed men from the bondage in which they were held by the fear of death,—it is presupposed that, by the power of his holy life, he left the grave victoriously at his resurrection, and by this event gave a pledge to his redeemed of freedom from death and sin, of a life of eternal happiness. It is said in v. 7, that Christ, who, as he had assumed human nature with all its weakness, sin excepted, was subjected to death, poured forth in

his struggle with death fervent prayers and tears to God who could redeem from death, and on account of his perfect resignation to the will of his heavenly Father, and his perfect obedience, was heard, that is, was delivered from death by means of his resurrection. The God of salvation is described in xiii. 20, as he who had brought from the dead the great Leader and Ruler of the church of God ; and in these words it is implied, that Christ by his resurrection became the leader from death to life of the church of God formed by him as the Redeemer, and laid the foundation for its salvation ; and therefore God, in raising him from the dead, proved himself to be the God of salvation.

We see, then, that the same view is taken in this epistle as in Paul's writings, of the connexion of the resurrection with the work of redemption. But that the exaltation of Christ to heaven is more frequently adverted to than his antecedent resurrection, may be traced to the prevailing form of the author's representations, in which Christ is compared to the high-priest of the Old Testament economy ; for as high-priest, having ascended to heaven and remaining there, he fulfils his office by interceding with God for believers, and bringing them into perpetual communion with God and heaven. A contrast is pointed out between Christ and the Jewish high-priest in this respect, that the latter could enter into the holy of holies in the temple, which was only a symbol of that in heaven, but once a year, and was obliged to leave it again, as he himself had no abiding residence in the most holy place, much less could he obtain an entrance into it for those on whose account he held the priestly office. It was a necessary consequence of this mode of representation, that there was less occasion for mentioning the resurrection, and that topic was brought forward more prominently to which the resurrection forms an introduction and transition.

But this idea of the high-priesthood of Christ is only a particular form of representing the general Christian idea of Christ as the Mediator, by whom the communion of the human race with God, broken off by sin, is again restored. That the writer of this epistle made use of this form, was principally owing no doubt to the peculiar character of the churches whom he addressed ; but in part probably to the peculiarity of his own religious training. This form is indeed borrowed from Judaism. Yet it by no means denotes a transient relation in the historical development of Christianity, but is connected with one of its constant relations to human nature ; a relation in virtue of which, under the consciousness of his earthly limitations and his sins, man feels himself in need of a mediation to fill up the infinite chasm that separates him from a holy God. Hence in all religions, and in the most diverse forms of civilization, methods have been invented for satisfying this want ; a caste of priests, or saints who have attained perfection by an unworldly asceticism, or some kind of mediators the offspring of the imagination, and a multitude of sensible objects, have been made use of, as points of connexion for the religious sentiment in its aspirations after God. Christ has for ever satisfied this

undeniable want of human nature, which no human being who himself stood in need of redemption and mediation could satisfy, and consequently all priesthood and sacrificial worship are henceforth superfluous and abolished. The redeemed are dependent on no other being for the purpose of mediating their relation to God. Through him they are brought into a lasting connexion with God and the heavenly holy of holies; through him, as the ever-living high-priest, they continually draw nigh to God: it is he who intercedes for them continually with God, and through their relation to him their whole life is consecrated to God and acceptable to him, vii. 25, 26. Now this is in perfect harmony with what Paul teaches (according to the explanation we have given of his views) respecting the scheme of mediation for believers; respecting the whole Christian life as a thank-offering for the blessings of redemption, and the free access to God through the mediation of Christ; and from the manner in which he applies to Christianity the Jewish ideas of the temple and the sacrifices and the whole ceremonial worship, we are authorized to infer, that he would make a similar application of the idea of the priesthood.

In order to realize this idea for the benefit of the human race, it was needful that Christ, who, according to his divine nature as Logos, effectuates the derivation of all created existence from God and its connexion with God, should from his own experience, become acquainted with all the weaknesses, sufferings, temptations, and conflicts of those for whom he had to intercede as high-priest, that he might understand the exigencies in which they would require his aid, feel genuine sympathy with their infirmities, and infuse true confidence into their hearts. At the same time, the writer of this epistle considers the sufferings of Christ in the twofold point of view, of active and passive satisfaction, which we have explained in the representation of the Pauline doctrine. Both are here combined in the idea of the all-sufficient sacrifices presented by Christ as high-priest, which effects that for which no religion of sacrifices was adequate. The relation of the sufferings of Christ as the Sinless One to the sins of mankind is thus illustrated: that as the sins of the people were symbolically transferred to the victim, (as if it could suffer what the people deserved,) so Christ in his sacrifice had taken upon himself the sins of mankind; his redeeming sufferings were the pledge that the guilt of sin no longer rested on them; ix. 28. As to the other part of Christ's work noticed by Paul,—his active obedience,—it is in this epistle expressly stated that Christ, according to the divine appointment, having proved himself to be the Holy One in all human temptations, and under the severest death-struggle, gained thereby the dignity of high-priest; v. 7, 8. The sacrifice of Christ obtains its due significance only in this moral connexion, not as an *opus operatum*, like the sacrifice of animals, but as the act of One who, revealing the eternal Divine Essence in human nature, and exhibiting the perfect union of the divine and human in a holy human life, verified it also in death, as the confirmation of a life

which had been the revelation of the eternal Spirit of God in a sinless, holy humanity. The significance of the death of Christ is founded on his having, "by an eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God." Thus the Epistle to the Hebrews distinguishes, as we find in Paul, two eras in the life of Christ; his appearance on earth, when he entered into fellowship with mankind, to bear the load of sin and to free them from it; and his life as the Glorified One, which no longer stands in relation to sin, but in which he only exhibits what he obtained by his perfect, holy life, and what those have to expect who are freed by him from sin and called to the perfect communion of his blessed life; ix. 28.

By what Christ has in this manner accomplished, he has now once for all made objective satisfaction for mankind to the requirements of the holiness of God, of the moral order of the universe. Mankind defiled by sin cannot enter into the heavenly sanctuary. They must first be purified and consecrated in order to enter into the fellowship of heaven.* This work, accomplished objectively by Christ, is now carried on in its consequences, till everything is conquered which opposes the realization of the holy kingdom of God among mankind, till that higher world, first apprehended by faith, becomes an actual reality to the sanctified human race.

Faith is also represented in this epistle as that by which this objective work is appropriated by individuals, and that by which this subjective purification is accomplished; that by which men enter into communion with Christ; iii. 6, 14. It is the confidence of faith which enables men to appropriate purification by the blood of Christ, and purges the heart from the consciousness of guilt; x. 22. We here find the same thing which Paul describes as justification by faith, only with an allusion to sprinkling with the blood of the sacrifices, in accordance with that reference to the Jewish cultus which pervades the epistle. As in Paul's writings, so it is here insisted that faith must prove itself genuine by perseverance; x. 36, iii. 14. And we find also the same connexion indicated between Faith, Hope, and Love; x. 23, 24.

In Paul's writings, there lies at the basis of the particular Christian application of the idea of faith, a more general conception of it as a general, fundamental direction of the disposition without which no communion with the divine, no religious life, can exist; and this idea is expressed in this epistle in a still more general way than when Paul points to justifying faith in the case of Abraham. It is described as being an apprehension of the invisible by the whole direction of the disposition,—a surrender of the spirit to something invisible by an act of inward self-determination, by which man raises himself above the natural connexion

* By a transference of the subjective to the objective, the writer of this epistle (ix. 23) speaks of a purification of the heavenly sanctuary itself, inasmuch as it would have been defiled by the sins of mankind could they have entered it without a previous purification.

of causes and effects, and enters, by the direction of his inward life into a higher order of things that reveals itself to him. Faith, according to Heb. xi. 1, is that by which the object of hope already becomes present; by which man is convinced of the reality of what he cannot perceive by the senses.* While in the constant succession in the phenomenal world he sees only the visible develop itself from the visible, and one phenomenon from another, and the understanding, cleaving to earthly phenomena, would explain and understand everything from this causal connexion; faith, on the contrary, rises to an act of creative omnipotence as the original ground of all existence, and acknowledges that the universe was made by the invisible creative word of God; xi. 3. Even here, agreeably to what we have remarked above, there is involved a peculiar Christian application of the general idea of faith, only what Paul distinguishes as justification through faith, is here represented under other forms on account of the references to the Jewish cultus. Moreover, in accordance with the peculiarly hortatory character of this epistle, faith is exhibited in its aspect of perseverance under all the sufferings and conflicts of earthly life;—faith in its unflinching constancy towards the future, a faith which steadily aims at consummation, and by which those who exercise it are matured for that final aim; (τελείωσις). By this faith a man follows after Christ, in whom a perfect pattern is exhibited, and who has passed through all temptations and conflicts, with an unwavering constancy of faith, to that state of glory whither all believers must follow him by the same path; xii. 2. But it has been most unjustly attempted to find a contrariety between the idea of faith in this epistle and in Paul's writings, as if in the former it merely implied a reference to something future, a conception of its nature which would best suit a lifeless Judaism. It is evident from the general, fundamental idea of faith as we have explained it, and from the whole train of thought in this epistle, that by means of faith a vital connexion is formed between the Present and the Future. By means of faith, according to the doctrine of this epistle, the Future becomes in some measure a Present to the mind, although this Present has a necessary bearing to a more perfect development, a consummation in the Future. In connexion with faith is given the experience of the glory of the divine word, vi. 5; by faith Christians are already united with the future world, and incorporated into the heavenly city of God, xii. 22. By faith they partake of the powers of the world to come, and obtain a partial anticipation of the Future; faith penetrates through the veil which conceals from human eyes the holy of holies in the heavens, and already enters it; vi. 19.

With respect to the relation between the ideas of this epistle and the ideas of the Alexandrian-Jewish theology as they are represented in the writings of Philo, we must here have recourse to one of the deepest-

* As Theodoret says, *δείκνυσιν ὡς ὑφ' ἑστῶτα τὰ μηδέπω γεγενημένα*, (it shows as present, things which have never taken place.)

reaching distinctions, the distinction between religious realism and religious idealism; in other words, to that theory which considers the positive and historical in religion only as a symbolical clothing of general ideas, and as the means of stimulating and training the mind towards the contemplation of ideas—and to that theory, according to which religion is acknowledged, not as an object merely of the intellect, but as an independent power in the life, a living communion with God effected by means of certain historical facts, as the highest end of a created being, and a complete satisfaction of his religious wants.

On this entire distinction of religious theories, a difference is founded in the interpretation of the Old Testament and of Judaism. Philo viewed the historical and the positive in Judaism only as symbolical veils of general ideas, which for the most part were borrowed from a very different system, and which he attributed to Judaism by an arbitrary disregard of historical accuracy. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews conceives of Judaism, according to its true historical destination and intention—to prepare the way for realizing the kingdom of God through Christ—to prefigure the divine in sensible forms—which would afterwards actually appear among mankind. If he arbitrarily explains some things according to the letter, yet a higher necessity lies at the basis of these meanings, the reference to the facts of religion from which the satisfaction of the religious wants of mankind proceeded, and which were really prepared by Judaism. The predominant idea of the epistle, the high-priesthood of Christ, has a significance entirely real, founded on historical facts, and relating to the most pressing religious wants of mankind. The Logos in himself is not the high-priest; he can only lay claim to this character in consequence of his having assumed human nature, and thus accomplished, in the manner described, the redemption of mankind. Christ as glorified and exalted to heaven, actually performs that for the religious life of men which their imperative religious wants seek in the priesthood. On the contrary, Philo calls the Logos himself the high-priest, as the divine reason revealed in creation, through which the creation is connected with the Deity. This reason, which reveals the highest Being, the $\delta\nu$, and communicates worthy and elevated ideas of the same, is hence called the high-priest of God in the creation. As the ideal ground of the phenomenal world, it mediates for it before God, for in idea all is perfect, but defective in actual appearance. The Logos is hence represented as the “world of thought,” $\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \nu\omicron\eta\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$, the “paraclete,” $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\kappa\lambda\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$, the “suppliant,” $\iota\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\tau\eta\varsigma$ for the “world of the senses,” $\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\iota\sigma\theta\eta\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$. This idea is symbolically represented in Melchisedec, and in the Jewish high-priest.* Thus we see here, on the

* See *Leg. Allegor.* iii. § 26, where Melchisedec is spoken of as the symbol of the Logos, $\iota\epsilon\rho\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\ \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, $\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\omicron\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega\nu\ \tau\acute{o}\nu\ \delta\nu\tau\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \psi\epsilon\lambda\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\acute{\zeta}\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ (for reason is a priest, having as an inheritance the true Being, and discoursing in an exalted manner concerning Him.) *De Cherubim*, § 5, the Logos is termed “priest,”

one hand, abstract general ideas which can have no significance for the religious life; and on the other hand, views taken from the facts of religious experience. On the one hand, the language of religion is arbitrarily explained, according to a speculation which was the production of a foreign soil; on the other hand, according to sentiments founded in the disposition which it was designed and adapted to express. Here it is proper to notice a passage, in which the author of this epistle describes the power of the Logos in a manner resembling Philo's, but which furnishes no sufficient evidence to assume that he had the language of Philo actually in his thoughts. That which is common* to them is the all-penetrating and cutting sharpness of the Logos. But, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, we have presented to us a matter of religious experience, the living power of divine truth, penetrating, judging, and punishing the soul, the power which lays open all secret wickedness, before which no deception can stand. But Philo understands by the term the power of logical discrimination, especially in reference to the divine reason, that efficiency by which it fixes the limits of the various kinds of existence, arranges the various classes of creatures, and forms compound bodies from the simple elements.

CHAPTER III.

THE DOCTRINE OF JAMES.

We proceed from Paul's representation of Christian truth to that of James, which comes nearer to furnishing a contrast to it than any

ιερεως, and "prophet," προφήτης, for the soul. *De Sacrif. Abel et Caini*, § 36, ὁ πεφευγὼς ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν καὶ ἰκέτης αὐτοῦ γεγονὼς λόγος, (reason which fled to God, and became a supplant of him.) The high-priest in his robes is a symbol of the universe, ἀναγκαῖον γὰρ ἦν τὸν ιερωμένον τῷ τοῦ κόσμου πατρὶ παρακλήτῳ χρῆσθαι τελειοτάτῳ τὴν ἀρετὴν υἱῷ, (for it was necessary that he, consecrated to the Father of the world, should have for a paraclete a son most perfect in virtue),—the world according to the Platonic idea. *De Vita Mos.* iii. § 14.

* Compare Hobrows iv. 12, with *Quis Rer. divinar. Hæres*, § 26: ἵνα τὸν ἀδίδακτον ἐννοῇς θεὸν τέμνοντα, τὰς τε τῶν σωμάτων καὶ πραγμάτων ἐξῆς ὑπάσας ἡρμόσθαι καὶ ἡνωθῆναι δοκούσας φύσεις, τῷ τομῇ τῶν συμπάντων αὐτοῦ λόγῳ, ὃς εἰς τὴν ὀξύτατην ἀκονηθεὶς ἀκμὴν, διαιρῶν οὐδέποτε λήγει τὰ αἰσθητὰ πάντα, ἐπειδὴν δὲ μέχρι τῶν ἀτόμων καὶ λεγομένων ἀμερῶν διεξέλθῃ, πάλιν ἀπὸ τούτων τὰ λόγῳ θεωρητὰ εἰς ἀμυθήτους καὶ ἀπεριγράφους μοίρας ἀρχεται διαιρεῖν αὐτὸς ὁ τομεύς. (In order that you may understand the untaught God who, dividing all the natures of bodies and things that seem to be consecutively fitted and united together, cuts through everything by his word, which, sharpened to the keenest edge, never ceases separating every object of the senses; and after it has passed through to the atoms and the so-called indivisible, this divider begins again to separate from these those things contemplated by the reason into unspeakable and indescribable parts.) *Philon. Opera*, tom. iii. p. 30, ed. Lips. 1828.

other in the New Testament. This is chiefly owing to James's peculiar point of view, and to the difference occasioned by it in the development of the doctrines of justification and faith. But on comparing the two types of doctrine with one another, we shall perceive the essential unity resulting from the Spirit of Christ in both, only that the views of the latter apostle were not so completely disengaged from the garb of the Old Dispensation, nor wrought out in the same sharply defined form. The contrast that here exists we cannot but regard rather as formal than material.

This difference is closely connected with the difference in the formation of the religious character of the two apostles, and with the difference in their respective spheres of labor. As to the latter, we must bear in mind, that James in his peculiar position had not, like Paul, to vindicate an independent and unshackled ministration of the gospel among the Gentiles in opposition to the pretensions of Jewish legal righteousness; but that he felt himself compelled to press the practical consequences and requirements of the Christian faith on those in whom that faith had been blended with the errors of carnal Judaism, and to tear away the supports of their false confidence. While Paul was obliged to point out, to those who placed their dependence on the justifying power of the works of the law, the futility of such works in reference to justification, and to demonstrate that justification and sanctification could proceed only from the faith of the gospel,—James, on the other hand, found it necessary to declare to those who imagined that they could be justified before God by a faith in the Jewish sense as we have before explained it, that such a faith with which their practice was at total variance, was an absolutely worthless thing.*

The apostle affirms, that as a sympathy that shows itself in mere words to the afflicted is worth nothing, so a faith without works is entirely vain. Accordingly, he compares a faith that does not manifest

* It serves to confirm what we have asserted above, viz., that the argumentation in the Epistle of James is by no means directed against Paul, that the example of Rahab adduced in it, cannot be supposed to relate to any use which Paul could have made of it; for the manner in which the doctrine of Faith is unfolded in the 11th chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, could certainly give no occasion to such a line of argument, since in that section, believing confidence is described precisely as a principle which impels to action, and the faith of Rahab is marked as being of a kind that induced her to receive the spies. The very point is here made prominent on which James lays so much stress, and hence we infer that it cannot form an antithesis to his own views. Nor could Paul, in his oral instructions, have made use of the example of Rahab; for in those passages of the book of Joshua there was nothing he could make use of in support of his doctrine of justification by faith. Nothing is to be found there respecting faith, nor of a being justified before God, and with those points alone St. Paul was concerned, and for their confirmation he quoted Gen. xv. and Habakkuk ii. This example of Rahab, which can only be explained from the reference to Paul's doctrine, testifies against the supposed discrepancy in the views of the two Apostles. The citation of such an example can be explained and justified, only from the point of view which we have taken.

itself by works, to a pretended love that is not verified by corresponding acts, to a sympathy that evaporates in mere words. From this comparison, it is evident that what he here describes as a pretended love is in his judgment undeserving of the name of love; the same may be said of a pretended faith. But as by arguing against the value of a love that only shows itself in words, he did not intend to depreciate the worth of love itself, just as little could he design to cast a slight on the worth of faith by what he says against the value of a faith that exhibits itself only in outward profession. He considers such a faith, which is unaccompanied by works, as dead; it is a faith which is destitute of that divine life which spontaneously produces good works. In reference to this necessary, intimate connexion between faith and works, James, from his point of view, permits one to say, addressing another who depends on this inoperative faith (ii. 18), "Show me how thy faith can exist without works, and I will prove to thee my faith by my works." "As the body without the soul is dead, so" (he says, ii. 26) "faith without works is dead." The comparison is here a general one, without descending to particulars. It is evident, that James could not mean to say that works (the outward act) bear the same relation to faith as the soul to the body, but only (which agrees with the whole train of his thinking) that the absence of works is a proof that the faith is destitute of what corresponds to the soul as the animating principle of the body. Works, therefore, are *signs of the vitality* of faith.

We shall be assisted in forming correct ideas of his doctrine respecting faith, if we examine the examples which he adduces of genuine and of spurious faith; on the one hand, the faith of evil spirits in a God, which only fills them with terror, and, on the other, the faith of Abraham. He here applies the same term faith to two distinct affections of the soul. In the first case, where the reference is to the faith of evil spirits, the feeling of dependence on an Almighty Supreme Being shows itself as something unavoidable, as an overpowering force, but it is only a passive state (a *πάθος*), with which the spontaneity, the free receptivity and self-activity of the mind by no means corresponds, to which the whole determination of the inward life is opposed. The feeling of dependence on God is something which man cannot get rid of, however much he may desire it. In the second case, faith is not merely something passive, existing independently of the self-determination of man, but a voluntary recognition of this dependence takes place by an act of the will, and thereby becomes a regulating principle of the whole life. Hence, in the former instance, works, as well as the whole tendency of the life, must stand in contradiction to what from this position is called faith; in the latter, the inward tendency of the life proceeding from faith necessarily manifests itself by works. That work of Abraham which the apostle adduces, was indeed no other than an expression of that unconditional and trustful surrender to the Divine will, which is likewise by Paul considered as a mark of Abraham's genuine and divinely approved righteousness. But

Paul adduces this example with a special reference to its internal importance, in opposition to a vain righteousness of works; James makes use of it in its outward manifestation against an *opus operatum* of faith; and in this point of view he could say that by his works Abraham proved that he was righteous; faith coöperated with his works in order to characterize him as genuinely righteous; by works his faith proved itself to be "perfect," *τελεία*. When the Holy Scriptures tell us that Abraham's faith was imputed to him by God for righteousness, this can only be understood of a faith which was accompanied with good works as marks of its genuineness. Certainly James, who believed in the Divine omniscience, could not suppose that the outward act was requisite to make Abraham's disposition manifest to God; but he meant to say that Abraham's faith could not have justified him before God, if it had not been such as would manifest its inward quality by such works. But Paul would not have applied the same term *πίστις* to two religious states that differed so widely from one another; he would hardly have designated by this name what James asserts of evil spirits; he would not have distinguished between a *fides informis* and a *fides formata*, but only have designated by this latter term the "faith that worketh by love." And although in combating the erroneous tendency he would have agreed with James, yet his method of combating it would have been quite different. He would have pointed out, as he has done in several passages of the Epistle to the Romans, the necessary, intimate connexion between faith and a moral transformation; he would have shown those persons who professed to believe, that what really deserved the name of faith, was entirely wanting to them. But the elements of such a demonstration are to be found in the Epistle of James, where he speaks of a new birth, a new creation proceeding from faith; i. 18. Yet it is not his manner to develop what is contained in the idea so systematically as Paul is wont to do, who exhibits to us, if we may so express it, the speculative and the practical, as they interpenetrate each other. James is throughout practical rather than speculative. He contents himself with stating experimental appearances, while Paul would profoundly investigate their causes. To Paul, the central fact on which everything turns is the relation of man to God, and the great revolution that must be effected in that relation in order that man, by nature estranged from God, may become an object of his good pleasure. Only to the sight of that God who beholds the inmost recesses of the spirit, and to whom the invisible world lies unveiled, is the whole new direction of the life apparent in that internal act of faith which lays hold of redemption, and from which everything must be developed that belongs to the perfection of the Christian life. In the sight of that Being who beholds the invisible, man is justified when he believes; he is justified by his faith. But James, who contemplates the outward manifestation of things as they are developed in time, takes into account the coöperation of faith and works for the justification of man; for like Paul he recognises only that faith which works

by love and thus originates the new creation in man, as justifying faith, and requires that it should express itself in works in order to distinguish it from whatever else may be called faith. Had James intended to say that works must be visible in order that man may appear just before God, this would have been a material contradiction between himself and Paul. But as surely as James acknowledged God as the omniscient who penetrates into all that is hidden from mortal vision, must he have known, that true faith and the right state of heart which it involved, must be manifest to God, before it could be discernible to man by its outward signs. But one thing is certain;—the point of view taken by these two apostles, the direction of their contemplations, is thoroughly different. The great difference in their respective positions is, that while Paul fixes his attention principally on the objectively Divine, the ground of God's election, on which the confidence of man must rest: James, assuming the fact of this divine ground, concerns himself with the subjectively human, with what man must do on his part.

A contradiction may indeed seem to exist between the two, when the one, as the mark of the position of legal righteousness adopts the phrase, "Do this, and thou shalt live!" and the other, from his position, says, "A doer of the work—this man shall be blessed in his deed"*: and we readily grant that Paul would not have expressed himself as James has done. But this contradiction vanishes, if we take care to notice the different connexions in which these words are used. Paul speaks of the law as the summary of individual, imperative prescriptions, and of man as under the law, antecedent to Christianity. James is speaking of the new law of life revealed by the Messiah, which he designates as the "perfect law," νόμος τέλειος, in reference to its forming the consummation of Judaism, just as Christ in his Sermon on the Mount represents the gospel to be the fulfilling of the law. Viewing it in this connexion, he also calls it the "law of liberty," i. e., doubtless from the fact, that those who truly receive it, render a free, loving obedience, issuing from an inward vital principle. He considers this law as equivalent to the λόγος, the published doctrine of Christ. By this doctrine the law becomes a law of freedom, and a perfect law, inasmuch as in the words of Christ the law first finds its full significance, and from faith in Christ the free obedience of love is first rendered to it. Thus the Christian state, in which the law becomes glorified, appears as that of freedom and perfection, in contrast to the earlier condition of bondage and imperfection. Since, then, James thus agrees with Paul, although he would not have made such a contrast as the latter apostle, between the gospel and the law, we are not justified in tracing modes of expression in James that resemble the Pauline, to the direct influence of Paul, but, we must rather refer what both have in

* Paul, from the legal as opposed to the evangelical stand-point, says, "The man that doeth them shall live in them," Ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς. James, from his own position, says, Ὁ ποιητὴς ἔργου οὗτος μακάριος ἐν τῇ ποιήσει αὐτοῦ ἔσται, "the doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed."

common, to the divine original fountain of the revelation of Christ, in whose words we can point out the connecting link. In reference therefore to the law, as the law of Christ, James says what Paul himself must have granted,—that mere knowledge can profit nothing—that it is all-important that this doctrine should not be made an object of mere indolent contemplation, but should evince its power as a law regulating the life—that whoever exemplifies this doctrine in his life, will be blessed in his deed*—that only he who regulates his life by Christianity can experience in life its blessed effects; he alone will feel truly blessed in the influence proceeding from Christianity.

In relation to moral requirements, James differed widely from the abettors of a Jewish legal righteousness, who laid more stress on a multiplicity of individual good works than on the regulation of the life by one governing principle; for it is one of the characteristics of this Epistle, and closely connected with his argument on faith, that he traces back belief, knowledge, and action, to the unity of the whole life proceeding from a godly disposition, and opposes the isolation of all those things which can only maintain their true significance when comprehended in that unity.

Thus he says, Whosoever imagines that the worship of God consists in certain single acts, deceives himself; it consists in the whole direction of a life devoted to God, in preserving oneself from contact with all ungodliness. He combats the superficial moral judgment, according to which a man believes that he may be excused for transgressing certain commands, if he only avoids certain sins. The law is a unity, and whoever violates it in only one point, is guilty of violating the whole. According to James, the fulfilling of the whole law consists in love; ii. 8. Hence he particularly speaks against those who were accustomed to consider an offence in words as a mere trifle, or who believed that they could exercise genuine devotion towards God while they were in the habit of passing uncharitable judgments on their fellow-men. This is a contradiction; good and evil cannot proceed from the same fountain; it is of the first importance that language should be the organ of a disposition that regulates the whole life both in word and deed. And in reference to the theoretical part of religion, he says that true wisdom and true knowledge must show themselves in the general course of the life. He considers the whole Christian life as a work. That perseverance which consists in maintaining the faith under trials must have its perfect work, that is, must consist not merely in single good acts, but embrace the whole of life; i. 4. Of practical Christianity, he says, that the “doer of the work,” ποιητῆς ἔργου, is blessed in his *doing*; i. 25.

* 'Εν, “in,” in James, i. 25, ought by no means to be translated *through*. The “shall be,” ἔσται, also, implies, that James considered the blessedness not merely as something proceeding from the deed as an outward result, but as something involved in the deed, a feeling that necessarily accompanied it; we are led to think of the beatitudes in the Sermon on the Mount. Compare also Schneckenburger's excellent remarks on this passage.

Although Christianity presented itself to this apostle as the consummation of the law, yet he by no means adopted the Ebionitish notion, that Christ had only perfected the Mosaic law by the addition of certain moral prescriptions, such perhaps as are given in the Sermon on the Mount, so that he might be considered simply as the Supreme lawgiver and teacher; but he acknowledged as the peculiar distinction of Christianity, the impartation of a new divine principle of life, which, by its operation from within outwardly, produced the fulfilment of the law. He beheld in the Messiah the author of a new moral creation through the divine principle of life which he communicated; he describes the word of truth as the instrument of regeneration, giving birth to a new creation; i. 18. The word (he affirms) must penetrate the very depths of human nature, and by an internal transforming power effect its deliverance from sin; i. 21. But he was very far from believing that the Christian could altogether come up to the requirements of the law of liberty, which seeks for a free obedience proceeding from love, and could thus be justified by his own course of life. He declares (including himself) that "in many things we all offend;" iii. 2. Every man, he says, must be penetrated by the conviction how much he stands in need of the divine mercy, that he may be able to stand before the divine tribunal; and ought to be impelled by this consideration to exercise mercy towards others; ii. 13.

After what has been said, it cannot be denied that there are differences between the two apostles, in the dogmatic and ethical mode of their instructions, differences to which in fact we have called attention; but still it may be shown, that though the Christian spirit appears more fully developed and more perfectly formed in one scheme of doctrine than in the other, yet the same spirit pervades both. Paul, though he considered good works as the necessary marks of the new spiritual creation, and the necessary fruits of an actual, internal righteousness, would certainly not have expressed himself exactly in this manner, that a man is justified not by faith alone, but also by his works, that faith and works must coöperate for his justification. He would not only have avoided saying this in reference to the legal works preceding the transformation of the life by faith, (in which James agrees with him,) but also in reference to the works produced by faith; for he always considered faith alone as that by which a man becomes just before God, and the source from which all other good develops itself by an internal necessity; and the life of believers, proceeding from faith, is always alloyed by a mixture of the flesh, for which reason a justifying power cannot be attributed even to those works which are the fruits of faith. But since James, as we have remarked, acknowledges the continual defects of the Christian life and the need of forgiveness of sin even to the recipient of the gospel—since he presupposes that the Christian can only obtain that mercy from God which he constantly needs, as long as he shows mercy to others—all material difference vanishes. Paul approaches nearer to James on another side, where he is less dogmatically exact, and is

not led to employ the strong contrasts which are frequent in the controversial parts of his writings, for even according to his own views, works necessarily belong to the Christian life as an expression of faith and of the righteousness obtained by it, and faith must be verified by the whole course of life; hence he asserts, on occasions when it was of importance to give prominence to this truth, that every man will receive his deserts, according to that he hath done in his earthly life, whether it be good or bad, 2 Cor. v. 10. Nor is it difficult to explain this mode of expression on the Pauline principles, and to show its perfect harmony with them. In the works which proceed from faith, the difference must be verified between genuine and spurious faith, and the difference will gradually make itself known according to the degree in which faith has penetrated the life. Although in redemption, justification, and the impartation of a new divine life, by which man is first rendered capable of accomplishing good works, all is an act of grace, yet, according to Paul's doctrine, there is also a rewardable righteousness, and the bestowment of a reward, in proportion as men show themselves active when the new creation has been effected, according as they make use of the grace bestowed upon them. And if such expressions, though strictly in accordance with the Pauline doctrine, were taken by themselves, they might, like those of James, be supposed to be contradictory to it. It is in these expressions that we find the doctrinal type of James.

Moreover, as James was altogether a Jew, but a Jew whose *views were rendered complete by faith in Jesus as the Messiah*, it was his aim to lead his countrymen by the same way which he had himself taken, from Judaism to faith in Jesus as the Messiah, though without departing from the customary national theocratic forms; hence he did not, like Paul, who labored among the Gentiles that stood in no national relation to the law, represent Christ as the abolisher of the law, but as its fulfiller; and this view was countenanced by Christ's own language in Matt. v. 17.* Hence the law to him became changed in its spirit; from being imperfect, it became perfect; from being a law of bondage, it became a law of liberty. But he received the new spirit under the old forms, similarly to many Catholics who have attained to free evangelical convictions, and yet have not been able to disengage themselves from the old ecclesiastical forms; or like Luther, when he had already attained to a knowledge of justification by faith, but before he was aware of the consequences flowing from it in opposition to the prevalent doctrines of the church. And thus James, though he acknowledged that the Gentiles by faith in Jehovah and the Messiah were entitled to the same theocratic privileges as the Jews who observed the law, did not enforce on the believing Jews the non-observance of the law, Acts xv. 21. And what he says to Paul in Acts xxi. 21,† implies that he would have thought it wrong to induce

* See Life of Christ, p. 91.

† The believing Jews needed no new precepts; they knew what they were bound to observe as Jews. See p. 127.

the Jews who were scattered among the heathen to forsake the observance of the law. Now Paul also was far from doing this; he allowed the Jews to remain Jews, as he allowed the Gentiles to retain everything in their national character and habits which did not contradict the spirit of the gospel: he himself did not repudiate his Jewish character and education, but celebrated the Jewish feasts with the Jews, when there was opportunity. But since he considered the religious obligation of the law in every respect as abolished, he must naturally have been less scrupulous in its outward observance, and must rather have felt himself bound to depart from it when required to do so by higher considerations, whenever the observance of the law was in any way incompatible with the duties and claims of his vocation, as for example, when it obstructed his free intercourse with the heathen. Among the Gentiles he lived as one by birth a Gentile; Barnabas and Peter did the same; Gal. ii. 14.* James would not have so easily agreed to this, nor indeed was such expansion of sentiment required for his peculiar sphere of labor, since his adherence to the observance of the law rather promoted his success among his countrymen, to whom *his special* ministry was confined.

With the difference in the doctrinal schemes of the two apostles, their manner of enforcing the duty of veracity is also connected. James repeats the command of Christ to the letter, as it was originally given, yet showing at the same time, that he correctly understood its sense and spirit. Among Christians, no oath ought to be required for a confirmation of what they asserted, their love of truth and mutual confidence ought to be so great, that their Yea and Nay should be a sufficient pledge. It was their duty to guard from the first against the guilt of falsehood or perjury; James v. 12. Paul does not mention Christ's command in this verbal form, but only enjoins, in reference to the disposition, that Christians should speak truth to one another, as being members one of another; and because language was intended for the very purpose of maintaining and exhibiting the spiritual communion, in which, as members of the same body, they must stand to one another. From this it was easy to deduce the obligation which they were under on this point towards society at large, since all men as rational beings, created for the realization of the kingdom of God, might be considered members one of another, and language was in like manner designed for the maintenance and exhibition of this more general relation; Ephes. iv. 25. And he had confessedly no scruple, when sufficient confidence was not felt towards him by all the persons concerned, and where it was of special

* Perhaps the partisans of James, mentioned in Gal. ii. 12, went down to Antioch for the purpose of examining whether the Jews who lived among the Gentiles, allowed themselves to be led into violations of the law, which they were not justified in doing by the resolutions of the apostolic convention; but it does not follow from this, that they were acting by the command, or even in accordance with the wish of James.

importance to obtain undoubting confidence in his assertions, to make use of a form of asseveration which would be deemed equivalent to an oath.

As the ethical element predominates in the Epistle of James, so an anxiety for the exclusion of every appearance of charging the causation of sin upon God is very conspicuous, and an emphatic maintenance of the freedom of the will, whose self-determination is the necessary condition of all the operations of divine grace. Let no one excuse himself (is the apostle's doctrine) for yielding to evil, on the plea that he could not withstand its enticements,—that a higher power, a fatality, a divine predestination hurried him into sin. Far be it from God to tempt any man to evil. As no evil can affect Him, the holy and blessed One, so he tempts no one to evil; but it is the indwelling sinful desire of every man by which he is seduced to evil. This also makes an opening for the temptations of Satan, yet even by his power no one can be forced to sin against his will; iv. 7. Thus the ground is taken away from every man for throwing off the blame of his sins by pleading the temptations proceeding either from God or Satan; since to the believer the ability is given, by his own higher moral nature (the image of God in his soul), and the guidance of the Divine Spirit, to withstand his sinful desires and the temptations of Satan; it must be his own guilt if he yield and allow himself to be carried away to the commission of sin. He has only to subordinate his own will to the will of God, and in communion with God to withstand the evil spirit, who will then flee from him; all temptation to evil will fail before a will that is in real earnest and devoted to God. Only let a man surrender himself to God by a steady determination of his will, and God's aid will not be wanting; i. 13–16; iv. 7, 8. James, like Paul, presupposes two principles of action in the believer—the image of God restored through Christ, and the sinful desire which still cleaves to the soul, and renders it accessible to temptations from without. When he says that the desire bringeth forth sin, (i. 15,) it is not meant, that the desire itself is something purely natural, or morally indifferent, but it is rather presupposed that the element in human nature, according to its actual condition, which, when a man does not withstand it, but surrenders himself to it, gives birth to the sinful act, is in itself something sinful. But James limits himself, for the most part, to the outward manifestations of the moral life; he does not, like Paul in the epistle to the Romans, go to the root of the opposition between good and evil in the depths of the human heart; yet he furnishes, even on this side, an important link in the complete development of Christian doctrine. The manner in which he expresses himself respecting the free determination of the will in relation to a divine causation in evil and good, furnishes us with an important complement to Paul's doctrinal scheme, where, (as in discussing the doctrine of election, predestination, and the unconditionality of the divine decrees,) owing to his peculiar character, and his practical or argumentative object, only one side of Christian truth is brought forward, only the fundamental nature of the Christian dispensation is dwelt on.

and other aspects of it are put in the background. Hence, if one will form a doctrinal system from such single passages, not taken in connexion with the analogy of the whole New Testament doctrine, errors must arise, which he would have learned to avoid, by comparing the degrees of development and peculiar schemes of doctrine belonging to the several apostles which serve mutually to complete one another.*

CHAPTER IV.

THE DOCTRINE OF JOHN.

JOHN, as compared with Paul, had this point in common with James, that, by his peculiar mental development, he was not adapted and disposed to that intellectual cast of thought which distinguished the dialectic apostle to the Gentiles. But if in James the practical element predominated, in John we find the intuitive, though deeply imbued with the practical; he presents broad contemplative views of the fundamental relations of the spiritual life, rather than trains of thought, in which, as in Paul's writings, distinctions and contrasts are made with logical precision and minuteness. In reference also to the peculiar development of his Christian life, he had not been led like Paul to faith in the Redeemer through severe conflicts and opposition, nor like him at last attained peace after a violent crisis. He resembled James in having become a Christian through a course of quiet development, but differed from him in this respect, that his higher life had not first been moulded to a peculiar form in Judaism, from which he had been gradually brought to faith in Christ, his conceptions of Christianity having been modified by his former views; but from the first, the whole development of his higher life had proceeded from a personal observation of the appearing of Christ and by intercourse with him. As the consciousness of his own moral disunion was awakened by the contemplation of a perfect divinely-human life, in which the archetype of man was realized before his eyes, so by continuing to live in communion with this model of perfection, he gained

* In reference to all the topics discussed in this chapter, I wish to direct the attention of my readers to an Essay by Frommann, a young theologian, distinguished, and dear to me, (now Dr. Frommann, pastor of the Evangelical Lutheran church at St. Petersburg,) in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1833, part 1. It will be clear to the attentive reader, that in the representation given above, I have viewed the subject, not under the light of a contracted dogmatism which would adjust all contradictions, but from that position which unprejudiced historical investigation and genetic development enable me to occupy. But I cannot hope to secure myself against the suspicions of the prejudiced, who, of all persons, deem themselves the most free from prejudice.

power to overcome that disunion. Hence everything in his view turned on one simple contrast;—divine life in communion with the Redeemer, —death in estrangement from him. And as the whole of his piety was the result of what he immediately saw and experienced in his intercourse with the Redeemer, all his modes of religious thought had their origin in the life of Jesus, and might be considered as so many reflections of it. It was this which gave them a vital unity, so that it was not possible to distinguish them into the practical and theoretical. This is shown in those pregnant words by which his style is marked,—*Life, Light, and Truth*; and their opposites—*Death, Darkness, and a Lie*. As in communion with God, the original fountain of life, which can be obtained only through his self-revelation in the Logos, the spirit of man finds its true life,—as when in this true life, the consciousness of the spirit develops itself, the life becomes the light of the spirit, and the spirit lives in the truth as its vital principle; so by the separation of the spirit from its original, by the disjunction of the knowledge of man's self and of the world from the knowledge of God, death, misery, darkness and falsehood are the result. The human spirit created after the image of the divine Logos, must be enlightened by communion with this divine fountain of life; a life in God, divine life as the true life of the spirit, is naturally accompanied by the true light of knowledge. But since man by the direction of his will has turned himself to the undivine, he has in so doing estranged himself from the source of his true light and life, and is no longer in a state susceptible of its reception. The divine Logos never ceases, indeed, to manifest himself to the souls of men, as Paul declares, that in God they live and move and are; his light shines in the darkness of the human race, who have turned away from God; and from its illumination emanated all the goodness and truth that preceded the personal appearance of the Logos; but this revelation was opposed by an impenetrable intensity of darkness.* Hence the Logos himself must

* I cannot entirely agree with the interpretation proposed by Frommann, in his excellent work on the doctrinal views of John; Leipzig, 1839, p. 249;—that John, in the first clause of i. 5, depicts the relation of human nature in its original state to the revelation of the divine Logos, and that in the second part of this verse, "and the darkness," *καὶ ἡ σκορία*, he speaks of that relation since the Fall. According to this, the *σκορία* in the first clause, to use the language of the schoolmen, would describe the state of man in the condition of *pura naturalia* as *informis, negative*, and from the revelation of the Logos the *gratia informans* must proceed, which man required for the perfection of his spiritual nature. But in John, we never find the representation of such a mere negative relation of the human spirit to the Logos, as existing apart from communion with him, and possessing a susceptibility not yet satisfied. "Darkness" always denotes, in his phraseology, an actual opposition against the divine light of the Logos, a predominance of the undivine. It is contrary to the style of his conceptions, that he should suppose the spirit of man, formed after the image of the Logos, to be in its original state otherwise than in communion with that divine source of life and light. Verse 4 relates to what the Logos was or ought to be, according to his essential nature, to mankind; and in verse 5, John passes on immediately to the state of mankind estranged from God by the misdirection of their will.

break through the separating limits—bring himself nigh to man estranged from God—reveal and communicate himself as the divine fountain of life in the form of an assumed humanity, a visible human life serving him only as a medium for the manifestation of the divine life which is in him, and for bringing men to a participation of it. John i. 7–14.

Satan appears as the summit and representative of this self-seeking tendency, dis severed from connexion with God, and hence given over to darkness and falsehood; John viii. 44. He stands not in the truth;* with the disposition that has become a second nature, he can find in the truth not a single point on which to rest, because there is no truth in him. Owing to his predominant tendency to falsehood he wants the organ requisite to receive the truth, and to connect himself with it, to admit and to appropriate the revelation of truth.

Where a created spirit yields itself wholly and purely to the self-revealing God, or the Logos, there is truth. Wherever he dis severs himself from this connexion, and lives, thinks, and acts in this state of selfish

* Frommann maintains, in his work before quoted, p. 332, that Satan, according to John's views, is no other than "the seductive spirit of the world conceived of in concrete personality;" the principle of evil in the world hypostatized; and that the idea of a fallen Intelligence is altogether foreign to this apostle. But if this were so, we must explain his language in one of three ways. Either he intentionally chose the form of such a personification; or the prevalent religious conception, which had proceeded from an embodiment of the idea of evil, had taken possession of his mind without his making it a subject of special reflection (which is Schleiermacher's view); or he really considered Satan as an absolute evil being who had existed from eternity. There appears nothing to favor the first supposition; with respect to the second, this doctrine is so closely interwoven with the whole system of John's theology, that we cannot help believing that he had been compelled to reflect on the meaning of this representation, and to form a definite idea respecting the nature of Satan and his relation to God. But the admission of an absolute Dualism is utterly irreconcilable with John's theism. There remains then no other alternative but the supposition that he considered Satan as the Intelligence who first apostatized from God. The passage in John viii. 44 contains nothing contradictory to this supposition. The persons whom Christ there declares to resemble Satan in their dispositions, he could not intend to describe as absolutely evil by nature, but as those who, by the repeated suppression of their nature derived from God, had attained this unsusceptibility for truth and goodness, this habitual perverseness. Frommann says, p. 335, that the fall of a good angel presupposes an original evil principle operating upon him, and, that in order to explain the existence of Satan, we are again driven to the assumption of another Satan. But this objection is obviated by what we have before remarked respecting the *necessary inexplicability of the origin of sin, founded in the very idea of evil*, see p. 388. We must again maintain what we have asserted against all attempts to find an absolute Dualism in John. The doctrine of a fallen spirit from whom all evil proceeds, we are justified in presuming to be the only one by which the idea of a Satan can harmonize with the strictly theistical conception which evidently lies at the basis of John's theology, if nothing in it can be proved contradictory to this supposition, as certainly nothing of the kind can be proved. But such a Dualism as is founded in Heraclion's idea of Satan, we cannot presuppose without hesitation in the idea of John, but it will be necessary to produce distinct expressions which afford positive evidence of such a conception.

separation, there is falsehood. As the truth, according to John, proceeds from the tendency of the whole life towards God, the true and the good are in his view one, as on the other hand, are sin and falsehood. When the spirit withdraws itself from the revelation of eternal truth, and suppresses its original consciousness of truth, self-deception follows, and the deception of others. Hence Satan is represented as a liar, and the father of lies. And thus have we the universal contrast: those who are in a state of vital communion with God, who have received a divine life, are born of God, and hence are called the children of God; and those who live in communion with that spirit from whom at first proceeded all the tendencies of sin and falsehood, or who are of the world, belong to the world—understanding by the world not the objective world as such, the creation of God, which, as founded in the Logos, and as a revelation of God, is in itself something good, but the world in a subjective reference, inasmuch as the consciousness of man is held by it, and separates it from its relation to God, so that a consciousness of the world torn from its connection with a consciousness of God becomes all-controlling.

Since, according to John, participation in the divine life depends entirely on faith in the Redeemer, this forms a new era of development in opposition to the former prevailing principle, and to that state of estrangement from God, and of moral corruption from which believers are extricated. Though we find in John no such ample representation of human nature in its estrangement from God, as is delineated in Paul's writings, (which may be explained from the peculiarity of his doctrinal method, and the peculiar style of his writings,) still it may be easily perceived that his views were essentially the same, and in perfect harmony with the essence of Christianity. We find here the same contrast between what human nature is, and is able to produce in the state of estrangement from God, and that higher position to which it is raised by the transforming influence of a divine principle of life communicated to it, or, in other words, the contrast of the *carnal*, σαρκικόν, and the *spiritual*, πνευματικόν. When John, in the introduction to his Gospel (i. 12), describes the children of God as those who owed this distinction, not to their descent from any particular race of men, and in general not to anything which lies within the compass of human nature;—when Christ says to Nicodemus, that what is born of the flesh is flesh;—such language is, in the first place, opposed to the Jewish notion that outward descent from the theocratic nation gave an indisputable right to participation in the kingdom of God and in the dignity of his children; but this particular application is deduced from a truth expressed in the most general terms, namely, the general position, that the natural man by his disposition is estranged from the kingdom of God, and must receive a new divine life, in order to become a member of it. Hence in John, as well as in Paul, the same conditions and preparations are required for participation in the blessing which Christ is ready to bestow on mankind, the consciousness of bondage in the God-related nature of man,—the consciousness of per-

sonal sinfulness—a sense of the need of help and redemption, a longing after a new divine life, which alone can satisfy all the wants of the higher nature of man. We may here adduce the allusion to the brazen serpent (iii. 14), where the Jews, who in believing confidence expected by looking at it to be healed of their wounds, represent those who, under a sense of the destruction that threatens them from their spiritual maladies, look to the Redeemer with confidence for spiritual healing; and all those parables in John's Gospel, in which Christ speaks of thirst for that water of life, and hunger for that bread of heaven, which he is willing to bestow. Accordingly John, in his first Epistle, says that whoever believes himself to be free from sin, is destitute of uprightness, and deceives himself; that such a man makes God a liar, since he acts as if all which the earlier divine revelations have asserted respecting human sinfulness, and which is implied in God's sending a Redeemer to the human race, were false; 1 John i. 10.

But in order that men may attain to faith in the Redeemer, and avail themselves of his aid, the outward revelation of the divine, with all the attestations that accompanied it in the external world, are not sufficient. Without the inward sense for the divine which is outwardly manifested in the person of the Saviour, they can give it no admission into their hearts. The outward power of the divine can exert no compulsive influence, but requires the mind to be already in a susceptible state, in order to produce its right effect. Without this, all external revelations and appeals are in vain; the unsusceptible "have eyes but they see not;" John xii. 40. Hence the attainment of faith depends on a preparative operation of the Holy Spirit on men's minds, by which a sense of the divine is awakened within them, and a consciousness of their higher wants. Thus a susceptibility for what will give real satisfaction is developed, so that faith naturally results from the conjunction of this inward susceptibility with the external divine revelation. To this Christ refers when he says to the Jews, (to whom, on account of the enthrallment of their minds in earthly things, his words were necessarily unintelligible and strange,) in order to draw their attention to the grounds of their being offended with him (John vi. 44, 45), that they should not think that they could come to him, that is, attain to faith in him, with such a tendency of their disposition.* No one (he declared) could come unto him who was not drawn to him by the Father who sent him; who had not heard the awakening voice of the heavenly Father in his inmost soul, and followed it. These words have indeed been misunderstood by the advocates of the Augustinian system, as if a divine excitement, independent of all human self-determination, were intended as producing that susceptibility for the divine; but this would be to impose a sense

* In contrast to their bodily coming to him; which was only on account of their bodily necessities, for which they thus sought to obtain relief; whereas the true spiritual coming to him must proceed from a feeling of their real, spiritual necessities.

foreign to the connexion and the design of the discourse ; and greater importance has been attached to a single metaphorical expression than it can have in such a connexion. Certainly the *divine* impulse must be here contrasted with what is merely sensuous and human ; and the figurative expressions denote the power with which the divine impulse, when it is once felt, operates on the soul,—the power with which the divine manifests itself to the self-consciousness ; but it is by no means said that this divine impulse of an operation of God to arouse the suppressed knowledge of God acts alone, and that man, by his free self-determination, does nothing to promote it. This supposition would be inconsistent with the design of all the passages of this kind, since, taken in their connexion, the words are intended to awake men to a sense of their criminal unsusceptibility as the cause of their unbelief. It would also contradict John's declaration of the condemnation that accompanied the appearance of the Redeemer and the publication of the gospel ; for this condemnation implies the fact, that in the different reception given by men to the gospel, their different susceptibility or unsusceptibility for believing is manifested, and thus the difference of their entire disposition and character.

According to the doctrinal views of John, a two-fold meaning is attached to the phrases, *to be of God*, *εἶναι ἐκ θεοῦ*, and *to be of the truth*, *εἶναι ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας*. They either indicate, in the highest sense of the words, the quickening first proceeding from faith through the divine spirit of life, which is the spirit of truth ; or in a subordinate sense, the general contact of the human mind with God, the taste for the true and the divine, that inward susceptibility founded on the developed knowledge of God, which is the preparative for faith. In reference to the latter meaning it is said, in John viii. 47, "He that is of God, heareth God's words ;" and xviii. 37, "Every one that is of the truth, heareth my voice." Hence, though John presents in diametric opposition the idea of the natural man estranged from God, and the man who is born of God, yet, according to his doctrine, various steps and transitions in the phenomenal world must be admitted between the first condition and the second, according as the original consciousness of truth and of God which has been suppressed by the sinful bias of the will, more or less prevents men from hearing the voice of God, and following the drawings of their heavenly Father.* The slumbering sense of God may indeed be awakened by the immediate impression of the glory manifested in the appearance of Christ ; but it may also happen that a man, by following the drawing of his heavenly Father antecedent to the revelation of Christ, uprightly strives after the divine and the good, and such a one is led through the divine to the divine. The confused partial revelation of God which had hitherto illuminated the darkness of his soul, and conducted him in life, leads him to the revelation of the divine original in

* The darkness which cannot admit the divine light that shines upon it.

human form, and he rejoices actually to behold the archetype in its effulgence which had hitherto shone upon him with only a dim and distant lustre ; John iii. 21.

With respect to John's idea of the work of redemption, that appears most prominent which he had received from the immediate observation of the life of Christ, and its immediate impression on his religious self-consciousness. The life of Christ as the humanization of the Divine, of which the design was to give a divine elevation to man, is the self-revelation of the divine Logos (as the revealing principle for the mysterious Essence of God) in the form of humanity, appropriated by him in order to communicate divine life to human nature, and to transform it into a medium for the revelation of the divine life. John's remarkable words, "The Logos became man, and we have beheld his glory as it was revealed in humanity," describe the nature of Christ's appearance, and what *mankind are to become through Him* who is the central point of Christian faith and life. The same sentiments are expressed in his first Epistle, "We announce to you as eye-witnesses, the manifestation of the eternal fountain of life, which was with the Father, in order that you may enter into fellowship with it." He states as the essential marks of this manifestation of the divine glory in human form, that he appeared full of grace and truth ; *grace*, which means the communicative love of God, God as love ; and *truth*, according to John's conceptions of it, as we have already remarked, is not anything speculative and abstract, but proceeds from the life, and embraces the whole unity of the life, and hence is one with goodness and holiness. Truth is the essential predicate of the inward unity of the divine life ; and Christ (in John's Gospel) calls himself the Truth and the Life. Hence, the ideas of love and holiness are the two divine attributes which (as far as it is possible to reduce John's pregnant words to precise forms of thought) will most nearly express what he represents as the characteristic of the glory of God revealed in the life of Christ, and agree with his using love and holiness in his first epistle as designations of the Divine Being generally.*

God has been glorified in Christ (John xiii. 31) ; in him as the Son of Man, by whom the archetype of humanity is realized ;—that is, he has exhibited in human nature the glory of God, the perfect image of God as holy love. As man was created in the image of God, and was destined to glorify God, that is, to manifest him in his glory with self-consciousness—that is now fulfilled by the Son of God in human form. The partial revelation of the heavenly Father in the obscure subjective consciousness of man, and his perfect revelation in the appearance of the Son, are mutually related ; the former was a preparation for the latter ; and the latter reflects fresh illumination on the former. As whoever understands

* John does not make use of the second term precisely, but it is implied in what he says ; for when he affirms in 1 John i. 5, "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all," since darkness is a designation of sin, light, by contrast, is expressive of holiness.

that revelation of God which pierces through the thick darkness of the soul, must be attracted by the perfect revelation of the same God in his Son, it follows, that whoever knows the Father must necessarily recognise the Father in the Son,—while the not recognising, or the denying of the Son, is a proof that a man knows not the Father, and is estranged from him. The image of the Father, in his holy love to man, is perfectly exhibited in the Son, and in him also was first revealed in a manner comprehensible to man what a being that God is, whose holy personality man was created to represent.* Through him God closes up the chasm that separated him from the human race, and imparts himself to them in the communion of a divine life; and by that life it is taught that all living knowledge of God can only proceed from life; and thus in all these respects he could say, "Whoever hath not the Son, also hath not the Father."

The Son is a perfect personality in humanity, in which the eternal personality of God is imaged. Thus by the drawing of the Father man is brought to the Son, and through the beholding of the Son he is led to the Father. Along with the Son man loses the Father, and with the Father he loses the Son. This is a position which appears with increasing luminousness in the historical development of mankind, and to it history is constantly giving a clearer commentary.

John contemplates the whole life of Christ from the beginning as a revelation of the glory of the Divine Logos, as in short a connected revelation of God; and hence the divine in reference to Christ must never be viewed as something isolated and extraneous. His miracles also, as marks of a divine power controlling nature, as witnesses to the presence of such a power, are not explicable from natural causes in the phenomenal world; they cannot be regarded as isolated or superadded from without, as a new order of facts differing in their essential qualities from the other works of Christ. The originally indwelling glory of God, at the beginning of his public ministry as the Messiah, was entirely veiled under the ordinary forms of human life; but from the beginning of his miracles, this glory coming forth on particular occasions from its concealment, manifested itself in such results in the world of the senses that even carnal men might be roused to perceive the presence of the Divine. It is only in reference to this beginning of a new epoch in his ministry for the revelation of the glory of God among mankind, that John distinguishes the beginning of the miracles of Christ (ii. 11) as the beginning of the revelation of his glory. When he tells us, that the Baptist saw the Spirit of God descending on the Redeemer, by which he was distinguished as the personage who would baptize with the Holy Spirit, he certainly did not

* After Christ had said (John vi. 45) that all must be led to him by the voice of his Father speaking in their hearts, he guards against a misapprehension, as if this was in itself a complete knowledge of the Father. This only the Son possesses, and he alone can reveal it. The former must be therefore something preparative, a guide to more perfect knowledge.

mean to intimate that Christ, according to the common Jewish and Judaizing-Christian view, was then first furnished with the fulness of Divine power for his Messianic calling;—for John's mode of contemplating his character is most decidedly opposed to such views. According to his own conceptions, since Christ was no other than the Logos himself incarnate, all that was divine in former revelations became concentrated in him; hence, single, transitory impulses and revelations of the Divine Spirit could not be attributed to him; but the Holy Spirit, which illuminated and inspired former prophets partially and occasionally, dwelt in him from the beginning in its totality, and operated by him from this time in those extraordinary signs which were perceptible to common men. It was precisely because the Son possessed his divine life, not as something communicated from without, but dwelling in his very being, and essential to it, because the divine fountain of life itself was manifested in him, that he alone could communicate divine life to others, John v. 26; and the baptism of the Holy Spirit which he administers, is no other than the immersion of human nature in the divine life communicated by him, so that it becomes completely imbued with it; John vii. 39.

But as the miracles of Christ appear sometimes in relation to the inward essence of his appearance, to the *glory*, *δόξα*, which proceeded from the indwelling of the Logos as simply belonging to his nature; so, on the other hand, they are the marks or signs of the revelation of this indwelling glory for carnal men, in order to lead them from his appearance in the sensuous world to the Divine, to excite their susceptibility for the total impression and display of the Divine glory revealed in the Son of Man. In this sense, Christ said to Nathaniel, whose faith was founded on these outward signs, "Thou shalt see greater things than these; from this time thou shalt see the heavens opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending on the Son of Man." Greater than all the signs and wonders which attended or followed it was his *advent* itself; for by it the chasm between heaven and earth was closed, it became the bond of communion between both, the medium by which the fulness of the Divine power was poured forth on mankind, and in comparison with which the total assemblage of Divine communications to the human race, all earlier Angelophanies and Theophanies, were only as so many single rays of the Deity.

We thus ascertain the gradations in the use of the term *faith* by John. Either he understands by it the acknowledgment of a higher power proceeding from impressions made on the senses, from the impression of extraordinary facts in the sensible world, as in ii. 23; or he presupposes the possession of the heart by an immediate spiritual impression of the Divine in the life and words of Christ, as was exhibited in Peter's confession; vi. 68.

Though John presents, with peculiar earnestness, the self-revelation and self-impartation of Christ as the incarnate Logos through the whole of his earthly life for an object of believing appropriation, yet it is evi-

dent from various intimations, that he attributes the same importance as Paul to the sufferings of Christ in the work of redemption. As far as Christ in his sufferings manifested the love of God to the fallen race of man, and carried the moral ideal of his life through a series of conflicts to its triumphant conclusion—and with self-denying labor completed the work which his heavenly Father had commissioned him to fulfil on earth—the Saviour affirms in reference to these his impending sufferings, that he had, in determination of will, already fulfilled them, xiii. 31; “now is the Son of Man glorified, and God is glorified in him.” He speaks of his sufferings as the completion of his life devoted to God as a sacrifice, xvii. 19; that he thus devoted himself to God, or presented himself as a sacrifice for his disciples, that they also might be consecrated or sanctified in the truth. The realization of the ideal of holiness in Christ’s life and sufferings, is here represented as the ground of the sanctification of the human race. Had he not himself realized this ideal, he could not have furnished this principle of sanctification for all mankind; but this principle of holiness for the whole life of humanity can each one receive for himself only by entering into communion with him, and by appropriating the truth which he announced. In John’s writings, as in Paul’s, we find the underlying idea of Christ’s bearing the punishment of sin for mankind, and the reconciliation of mankind with God through him, though this idea is not so expressly developed; but, in accordance with his method, the idea of Christ as the dispenser of divine life, and the founder of a communion in that life, is made, for the most part, the predominant one. Thus John the Baptist compares him, as innocent and full of heavenly mildness and patience under sufferings, to a Lamb, on whom the punishment of sin and the guilt of mankind are (as it were) laid and thus carried away;* and the apostle himself thus designates him in his first epistle, the sin-offering, the *ἱλασµός* for sin. And when Christ had been declaring that divine life would be attained only in communion with him, that as the bread of heaven he was the same for the spiritual life of man which material bread is for the bodily life; he adds, (vi. 51), that the bread† which he *will* give is his body,‡ which he will give for the life of the world, he then repeats the same idea though under a different form, and describes how he must be received in his whole nature, Divine and human. We are therefore led to believe, that between these two views, of which one relates in general to the whole being of Christ, and the other to his offering up himself for the salvation of men, an internal connexion must exist. The communication of divine life by the Redeemer,—all that his divine life could effect for mankind, depended on

* We have not entered into the controversy respecting the sense in which the Baptist originally used these words, since it is here only of importance to determine the ideas of the apostle John on the subject.

† This is not exactly the same as his calling himself, in his whole being and appearance, the Bread of Life.

‡ To justify this interpretation, I refer to Lücke’s commentary on these words.

this, that as he himself had glorified the Father on earth, he would be exalted, in that human nature in which he had so glorified him, above the limits of earthly existence to the fellowship of his Father's glory; that he might from that time, by an invisible spiritual agency, complete among men the work of which he had laid the foundation during his earthly sojourn, that he might now glorify him through the development of the divine life, and the victorious progress of the kingdom of God on earth. (xvii. 1-5.) Christ himself points out this necessary connexion in that passage of John's Gospel, where he compares his life on earth to a grain of corn which must first be dissolved, and lose its peculiar form, in order that it may not abide alone, but bring forth much fruit. The divine life remained hidden in himself as his own exclusive possession during his sensible presence on earth. There was indeed a natural reason for this, that the apostles, as long as they saw Christ sensibly present among them, and enjoyed on all occasions his outward, personal guidance, were dependent on his outward, personal superintendence; they could not raise themselves above his human personality to the higher point of view of him as the Son of God, to an independent spiritual communion with him apart from his bodily presence and agency, and therefore had not attained to the independent maturity of the spiritual life which proceeded from the Redeemer. Under these circumstances, the disciples could not have been fitted for a participation of the Redeemer's life, if his sensible presence had not first been withdrawn. But this negative, the removal of this hindrance to the higher influence of Christ on the disciples, would not alone have been sufficient for completing the divine work in their souls, if with the negative there had not also been connected the advent of a new positive power. His ascension to heaven was only a necessary preparation for making the disciples susceptible of the divine influences of the glorified Redeemer. In the firm consciousness that he would be able to operate with such power on mankind, Christ said, (John xii. 32), that when he should be lifted up from the earth, he would draw all men unto him. In reference to this connexion of events, John contemplates (vii. 39) the communication of the divine principle of life which would be made by Christ to believers, which would pervade the character of each individual, as well as the life of the collective body, and which would bring the Christian life to its full vigor and maturity,—the communication of the Holy Spirit, *πνεῦμα ἅγιον*, a result of the glorification of Christ, which would not take place till that event was realized.*

* With respect to the question,—in what sense the words in John vii. 38 were originally spoken by Christ, they relate not to one definite future transaction, but, as John iv. 14, to a principle quite generally expressed, that faith in him would be for any individual a fountain of divine life, which was represented under the image of living water. But John was justified in saying, that what Christ here spoke could not be fulfilled at that time, since the consciousness of a divine life received from Christ was not yet developed in believers, but would take place at the effusion of the Holy Spirit, which would produce that consciousness; his language is therefore, in this respect, somewhat prophetic. The

Whatever is required on the part of men for the appropriation of what Christ effected as the Redeemer of mankind, John includes in *faith*. This is that one work which God requires, John vi. 29, in contradistinction from the *many works*, *πολλὰ ἔργα*, of Jewish legal holiness; and from this one internal work, this one inward self-determination, everything will spontaneously follow which is requisite for the sanctification of man. But he distinguishes, as we have already remarked, the faith that proceeded from the predominance of a sensuous element, the faith of authority, (which as it arose more from an impression on the senses than on the mind, easily gives place to other sensuous impressions, and vanishes,) from the faith which, as it proceeds from the inner life, from the deeply felt need of a redemption from sin, or from an impression of the divine received into the very depths of the heart, and therefore penetrating deeply into the heart, produced *the continuing in the word of God, the having the word abiding in himself*, *μένειν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἔχειν τὸν λόγον μένοντα ἐν ἑαυτῷ*. This faith (as in Paul) is a direction and acting of the disposition, by which a man surrenders himself wholly to him whom he acknowledges as his Redeemer, and enters into communion with him. By this faith, entrance is made into communion with the Redeemer, and at the same time a participation obtained in his divine life. Whoever believes on him has everlasting life, has passed over from death unto life, is regenerated by the Divine Spirit, who, instead of the former predominant principle of sin, is now the determining power within him; he is awakened to a divine life, and has become a child of God. From this condition a new form and a new law of life now spontaneously develop themselves.

What John asserts respecting the relation of Christ's precepts to faith, readily harmonizes with the Pauline view of the relation of the law to faith. He speaks, it is true, of the commands of the Lord in the plural number, but they are all traced back to that one which is the characteristic of the "New Covenant," *καινὴ διαθήκη*, the command of brotherly love; and the novelty of this command compared with the commands of the old law, is shown in its enjoining on believers to love as Christ loved, when he gave his life for the salvation of men, to exercise a self-sacrificing brotherly love according to his example. From this reference to the Saviour, it is immediately evident that such commands cannot be intended as are prescribed from without, in addition to

New Testament ideas of "eternal life," *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*, and of "the Holy Spirit," *πνεῦμα ἅγιον*, are closely connected; they are related to each other as effect and cause. Though with faith in Christ the impartation of a divine life was granted to believers potentially and in principle, yet the effect was first manifested after the effusion of the Holy Spirit. From that era, the divine life resulting from the participation of the Divine Spirit which believers received, streamed forth on mankind, and subsequent history furnishes the correct interpretation to these words of Christ, and verifies their truth. John, therefore, gives an historical commentary rather than a simple verbal explanation.

believing, but only those which are spontaneously developed from the divine life, which accompany faith, as obligations necessarily involved in it, requirements of the law of the inward life, as so many distinct traits in which the image of the life of Christ exhibits itself to believers. This new command presupposes faith in the redeeming, self-sacrificing love of Christ, and from the knowledge of this love the impulse is awakened to exercise similar love towards the brethren; 1 John iii. 16; iv. 10-19. John says, (1 Ep. v. 3,) that the commands of Christ are not difficult, though they exhibit an ideal of holiness; but he affirms this, not on account of their contents, but on account of their peculiar relation to faith, and to the inward life of believers; because these commands do not as a mere dead letter oppose the principle of sin which rules in the hearts of men, but presupposes the life-giving spirit of love which develops itself from faith, since both the inward impulse and the power to fulfil them proceed from communion with the Redeemer, the new divine principle of life. John himself adduces as a proof that these commands are not difficult, this fact, that what is born of God receives power to overcome all that is undivine, that faith in Jesus as the Son of God has the power of overcoming the world, that in this faith is already placed the victory over the world and all that is undivine; 1 John v. 4; even as Paul declares that a man with this faith is already practically dead to the world. Christ, in the Gospel of John (xvi. 33), requires those who believe on him to confide in his having overcome the world (the whole power of evil)—to be assured that through him it had been brought to nothing; believers, accordingly, by virtue of their fellowship with him, share in this victory, they need no longer to dread the power of that enemy, and hence John could term faith itself "*the victory that overcometh the world.*" But whoever keeps not Christ's commands, proves by his conduct that he is destitute of that divine life and communion with Christ, and therefore cannot in a true sense believe on him. Whoever lives in sin, and pretends to believe in Christ and to know him, is in fact very far from knowing him or believing on him. According to John's conceptions, it is impossible to separate either faith or knowledge from the life. Whoever knows Christ can know Him only as the Holy One who appeared to destroy the kingdom of evil among mankind, and to take away sin. And whoever has known him and believed in him as such, whoever has received the image of such a Christ into his inward life, can no longer live in the service of sin.

Very different from this faith in the real historical Christ, was the superstitious belief in that phantom which men formed of a Messiah in conformity with their own evil inclinations. An example of the latter kind of faith is mentioned by John in his Gospel, ii. 23, where he says that many believed in Jesus as the Messiah, on account of the miracles which they saw him perform. But since they were not actuated by the feeling of a higher necessity, nor sought and saw in Him a Saviour from sin—since they were not susceptible of the spiritual impression of the

Divine, but were only touched by an impression on the senses, only such an image of the Messiah could be formed in their minds as corresponded to a desire that was composed of carnal elements. Hence their faith, or rather their superstition, when its carnal expectations were disappointed, was soon succeeded by unbelief. Hence Christ would not surrender himself to the enthusiasm with which they professed attachment to him, for by his penetrating glance into the secret state of their hearts, he knew that they were still far from that faith which would be capable of fellowship with himself. To such a faith, which would require to be purified from the alloy of the sensuous element by awakening the slumbering religious sentiment through intercourse with the Redeemer, Christ referred when he said to the multitude who professed to believe on him, (viii. 31,) "If they now really should receive into their hearts, and appropriate that word to which they had hitherto given only a superficial acceptance, they would thus become truly his disciples—they would know the truth in their inward life, and by its power pervading their whole being, would be progressively freed from everything by which their higher nature, the religious sentiment implanted in their constitution, had been held in bondage."*

Though John contrasts the children of God, those who are born of God, with those who belong to the world, to the evil spirit, the children of the devil, but only in general terms without any gradations; yet in the idea of the former, he by no means supposes an equally definite and complete manifestation in every individual, and is far from excluding various degrees of development. He says, as we have already noticed, that faith involves victory over the world, and that whoever believes in Jesus as the Son of God, by the power of this belief overcomes the world. By virtue of the divine principle of life which he has received, temptation to sin can find in the believer no point of connexion, and everything which assails him from without, can only contribute to promote the development of the divine life in him, and the victory of the cause of Christ, which by its nature is all-conquering, and presses through everything that opposes it to completion; 1 John iv. 4. Whoever is born of God sinneth not, but preserves himself from all the allurements to sin, and the evil one toucheth him not, (evil can find in him no point of connexion; 1 John v. 18.) Because he is born of God, it is impossible for him to sin; since the seed of the divine life dwells within him, from which

* In this passage, the idea of freedom is presented under a different aspect from what we find in Paul's writings, not in contrariety to legal bondage, but to a political semblance of freedom. True freedom, Christ says, is inward, proceeding from redemption. Till man has attained to this, he is still in slavery, though enjoying complete outward independence, since he does not freely regulate himself according to the law of his original and true nature, but is controlled by a foreign principle, by which this his original and true nature is oppressed. But it will easily be seen, that the same general idea of the contrariety between freedom and slavery, as in Paul, lies at the basis, and the three-fold condition in the moral development of man may be readily deduced from it.

nothing evil, but only good, can proceed ; 1 John iii. 9. But from this description we are not to conclude that the idea and its manifestation perfectly correspond, and that it is intended to exhibit the Christian as sinless. John presupposes the contrary, since even in Christianity he still admits the need of forgiveness, and of progressive purification from sin. "If we confess our sins"—is his language,—that is, are penetrated by a consciousness of the sin that still cleaves to us, and are filled with a feeling of penitence,—“God is faithful and just* to forgive our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness,” 1 John i. 9. We must, therefore, take the following view of John’s doctrine: though the Christian as such, in reference to his life founded on communion with Christ, cannot be reached by sin, though his divine indwelling life cannot in itself be touched by sin, yet as it is engrafted on a sinful nature which is continually opposed to it, it is always subject to being disturbed by sin’s incursions, from which it can only be preserved by maintaining a constant warfare. The divine life, until it has pervaded and appropriated man’s whole nature, which can never take place during his earthly existence, must develop itself by a continual process of purification; to this subject relates what Christ says in the metaphor of the vine; John xv. Indeed, his disciples were already pure through the word spoken by him, inasmuch as they had received it as a purifying principle into their souls; but it was needful for its purifying power to be manifested by an inward, thorough purification of their whole nature. As the vine-dresser cuts off from the fruit-bearing branches of the vine all the useless shoots, that it may produce more fruit, so God purifies the whole nature of man by a gradual process which develops itself from a life in communion with Christ, in order that the fruit-producing power of the living sap received from him may not be lessened by mixing with the foreign sap belonging to the wild stock of the old nature, but manifest itself in continually richer fruits, the works of a genuine Christian disposition.†

In this manner we may easily explain the apparent contradiction in John’s language, when he says that whoever sinneth knoweth not Christ, and yet speaks of the forgiveness of sins as needed by every Christian, and ready to be imparted to him. The life of the believer

* Two ideas are here closely connected. The faithfulness of God consists in this, that God in his acts, in the government of the world, shows himself always self-consistent; he responds to the expectations which he has awakened by his revelation in words, or by his providence in general history, or by the operations of his Spirit in the lives of individuals, and fulfils his promises; and as he has promised the forgiveness of sins to those who confess them, he bestows that blessing. His justice is shown by his fulfilling the laws which he established for his own kingdom; he gives to every one what belongs to him according to these laws; and thus the forgiveness of sins is granted, whenever the condition is fulfilled on which it was promised.

† The Pauline doctrine of good works as fruits of faith, and also the Pauline doctrine of charisms as the fruits of human nature when pervaded and purified by the divine principle of life, find here their point of connexion.

is distinguished from the life of the natural man by this, that it is animated, not by the principle of sin, but of the divine life, and hence what is sinful appears only as something that belonged to his former condition, but still cleaves to him, and is therefore always opposed by him. Accordingly, John represents these two states and tendencies of life as totally irreconcilable; walking in the light is a life devoted to God by its prevailing tendency; and to walk in darkness is a life devoted to sinful inclinations, and proceeding from a sinful tendency.* We here may observe the unity of John's doctrine with that of Paul. As Paul represents faith, in its idea and principle, as an act by which a man dies to himself, the world, and sin—but yet, in the new life developed by its practical operation, infers a continual mortifying of the sinful principle; so likewise in John we find the same relation exhibited between being born of God, and maintaining a conflict with the world and sin. The distinction which is founded on these views between the objective of redemption apprehended by faith, and the progressive subjective development of the divine life, leads to the Pauline conceptions of “righteousness,” *δικαιοσύνη*, and of “justification,” *δικαίωσις*. John also contemplates the perfectly Holy Jesus objectively as the intercessor with the Father for believers who are still burdened with sin.

As, according to John's ideas, the future is already apprehended by faith as present, so the divine life in the present is viewed as the commencing point and germ of a creation that embraces eternity. As an anticipation of the future thus exists in the present, there is a necessary reference to a future development and consummation. Who-

* It is the object of the First Epistle of John to counteract the false confidence in the forgiveness of sins, the error that a man continuing in sin can be a partaker of forgiveness; a Christian sympathizing love towards erring brethren at the same time not being excluded. By these brethren, who have a claim on Christian sympathy, he understands those who, though in general they had evinced an earnest desire for sanctification, had yielded to some sudden temptation. It is true he considers all sin as standing in contradiction to the divine life, to the *ζωή*; but still a transient decline of this higher life, which has already become predominant over the sinful principle, is to be distinguished from an absolute suppression or entire destitution of it. The apostle here refers to such a momentary decline as results from yielding to temptation. It is the Christian's duty to pray for such fallen brethren, and it may be expected that God will revive them again, since it is presupposed that the persons who are the objects of this intercession, have still within them the germ of the Christian life, and are in a state susceptible of such a divine operation. But, on the other hand, John, in describing the acts that proceed from such a sinful state, which is marked by a total destitution of the divine life, a continued spiritual death, employs the phrase *sins unto death*, *ἁμαρτίαι πρὸς θάνατον*. To such cases the intercessory prayers for the forgiveness of sins could not relate, since the persons in question did not belong to the Christian community. But it by no means follows that believers were not to pray for their conversion; only they were not to consider them as *Christian* brethren, and pray for them in that sense in which those who were conscious of sin still cleaving to them, prayed for one another. Lücke, in his excellent commentary, agrees with this view of the subject.

ever believes in the Redeemer (John declares) *hath* eternal life—he has passed from death unto life—he can die no more—he can no more experience death. The divine life which he has received, can no more be interrupted by death. During his earthly existence there is the beginning of the development of this divine life; it is a fountain which springs up to everlasting life, which continues to flow onward till it enters the ocean of eternity, John iv. 14. Believers have the firm consciousness that they are the children of God, 1 John iii. 2, and that they shall attain to the full possession of all the rights and privileges founded on this relation; but the full understanding of what belongs to the realization of this idea is not yet granted to them—the dignity of the children of God in all its extent can be known only by its actual manifestation. But as in divine things knowledge and life are inseparably united, the perfect knowledge of Christ and God will accompany the perfect formation of the life in their image; 1 John iii. 2. Thus the same connexion between the life of faith and of hope is here exhibited as in Paul's writings.

But it is a characteristic of John's views, that a reference to communion with the Redeemer in the inward life and in the present, predominates over the reference to the future and to outward facts; he dwells upon the elements of the inner life, the facts of Christian consciousness, and only slightly adverts to outward matters of fact, and what relates to the Church. In accordance with this spirit, he exhibits all the particular incidents in the outward history of Christ only as manifestations of his indwelling glory, by which this may be brought home to the heart; he always avails himself of these narratives, to introduce what the Redeemer declared respecting his relation to mankind as the source of divine life. John is the representative of the truth which lies at the basis of that tendency of the Christian spirit, which sets itself in opposition to a one-sided intellectualism and ecclesiastical formality, and is distinguished by the name of Mysticism.

The same peculiarity marks his representations of the Judgment and of the Resurrection. The judgment he considers as something present, as a fact inseparable from the redemption of mankind and the publication of the gospel.

There follows, as a necessary consequence, a separation between those who with susceptible minds receive the divine, and those who exclude themselves by their unsusceptibility; those who, with a sense of their spiritual necessities, receive the offered redemption—whether a longing and striving after the divine life had already developed itself in their higher nature, or that the suppressed religious consciousness and this longing had been awakened through intercourse with the Redeemer; and those who, either by the predominance of the sensual element, or by spiritual pride and confidence in a legal righteousness, were prevented from attaining a knowledge of their need of redemption, and from surrendering themselves to the impression of the divine in the appearance, words,

and works of the Redeemer. John always considers judgment as merely the opposite of salvation, of *σωτηρία*; for the judgment of a Holy God is such that no man can appear before it as guiltless. The ideas of the judgment of God and condemnation must coalesce in their application to man estranged from God by sin. But the revelation of God's love in redemption appears as a deliverance from the condemnatory judgment, and nothing more is required than the acceptance of the offered mercy through faith in the Redeemer. He who will not believe, owing to his predominant sinful tendency, excludes himself from the offered salvation, and the judgment that he pronounces against himself is founded on the unbelief which proceeds from the state of his interior disposition; John iii. 17. God sent his Son into the world (that is, caused him to appear among the mass of mankind hitherto estranged from God)—not to condemn the world—(as the Jews imagined that he would pass sentence on the Gentile world), but that mankind, who were under the dominion of sin and estranged from God, might be rescued through him from impending ruin. Whoever now believes on him, is not condemned; he has appropriated salvation by faith, and such a one, being certain of eternal life in communion with the Redeemer, need no longer dread condemnation. But whoever does not believe on him is already, as a matter of fact, condemned by his own unbelief. In this consists the judgment, that men from their love of darkness (of ungodliness), on account of the sinful tendency of their life, are not willing to admit the fountain of light, (this their conduct towards the divine, as it proceeds from their disposition, is in fact judgment). As the gospel cannot reveal its power for the salvation of men without this process of separation taking place, which John calls judgment, the object of Christ's appearance must include with the redemption of the susceptible, their separation from the unsusceptible. "*For judgment,*" said Christ, "*I am come into the world, that they who see not,*"* that is, those who see not, but are at the same time conscious of their not seeing, and are actuated by a sense of their need of illumination, "*may obtain their sight,*" may be cured of their blindness in respect to divine things; "*but that they who see,*" who have the means granted them of knowing the truth, but who are not disposed to know it, and who are prevented from humbling themselves before the true light by the self-conceit of their imaginary discernment, and though they have eyes to see, they see not, "*may be given up to their blindness;*" John ix. 39, 40.† To such a moral judgment connected with the publication of the gospel we must refer what Paul says of the publication of the gospel, that to some it is the savor of life unto life, and to others the

* Not without reason is the subjective particle of negation, *μη*, here used.

† As in the instance which gave occasion to this whole discourse, the blind man was made to see by the Redeemer, and as one spiritually blind, who supposed that he could not see, he was healed of his spiritual blindness and enlightened; while, on the contrary, the deluded Pharisees showed that, having eyes to see, they were blind, since, in spite of facts, they denied the truth.

savor of death unto death; 2 Cor. ii. 16. But the idea of this progressive moral judgment through history, as well as the idea of the continued spiritual awakening of mankind by the publication of the gospel, by no means excludes a final judgment and a universal resurrection; but the former appears as a symbol and preparative of the latter, and the connexion of the two is exhibited in Christ's discourse in the 5th chapter of John's Gospel. At first, Christ speaks of the power conferred upon him as the Messiah to awaken the spiritually dead, and at the same time to judge them according to their respective conduct towards the divine life that was offered for their acceptance. As the Father awakens and makes alive the dead, so also the Son gives life to (awakens to a true divine life) whom he will;* for the Father has committed to him all the power of judgment, that all may show their reverence for the Father, by the manner in which they reverence the Son. He who honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father who sent him.† "He who receiveth my word and believeth on him who sent me," continued Christ, corroborating his former declaration, "*hath everlasting life*, and cannot come into condemnation, but is passed over from death unto life." By participation in a divine life, he is already removed beyond the reach of judgment, which can only affect those who are estranged from God. "A time is coming, and already is" (inasmuch as Christ by the power of his words had already produced such effects), "when the dead" (the spiritually dead in the whole race) "will hear the voice of the Son of God" (by the publication of the gospel), "and those who hear, shall live; for as the Father hath the fountain of life in himself, he has also given to the Son to have life in himself;" (only because the eternal, original fountain of divine life in the Son has communicated itself to mankind, can divine life be imparted to the dead through him;) "and he hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is Son of Man." As man he came to impart divine life to men; and thus as man to administer judgment to men. Then Christ passes on from the present to the future, from the process of development among mankind, to the last decisive result, and says, "Marvel not *at this*; for the hour is coming in which all who are in their graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth; they who have done good to the resurrection of life, and they who have done evil to the resurrection of condemnation;" John v. 28, 29.

It is owing to the same peculiarity which characterises John as the author of the *Spiritual Gospel*, *εὐαγγέλιον πνευματικόν*, that in the last conversation of Christ with his disciples, he does not mention what relates to his resurrection, his return to inflict judgments on the reprobate

* This was intended to point out to the Jews, that everything depended on the manner in which they conducted themselves towards him; and that the communication of the divine life was not to be confined within the limits which, from their national, theocratic conceptions, they wished to assign to it.

† In this consists the judgment, that every man proves by his conduct towards the Son what his feelings are toward the Father.

city of God, and his coming to the final judgment and the consummation of the church, but only the promises of an inward revelation of his Spirit to his disciples, that after his bodily presence was withdrawn from them, and when they might suppose that they were altogether separated from him, he would reveal himself to them in a more glorious manner, and receive them into his communion never again to be separated from them. The bodily reappearance of Christ among his disciples appears, in this connexion, only as of preparatory importance for continued spiritual communion with them, his constant spiritual self-revelation among them; so this reappearance of Christ for the religious development of the apostles, and the development of the church in general, was only of such preparatory importance, and intended to form a transition-point. Thus in these promises contained in John's Gospel, the reappearance of the risen Saviour is certainly presupposed, although the fact is not expressly mentioned. It lies at the basis of these promises, though they do not distinctly refer to it. And in this respect it amounts to the same thing, whether we admit one such reappearance of Christ after his resurrection, or several of the kind.*

In order gradually to prepare their minds, he begins with assuring them that the Father would give them, instead of his own sensible presence among them, another helper to abide with them for ever,—the Spirit of truth, who alone could impart the full knowledge of the truth announced by himself, and who would communicate himself through this truth, as he says (John xvi. 14,) that his Spirit would glorify him, for he would open to them the meaning of the doctrine he had taught. But since this Spirit is no other than the divine life communicated by Christ, the indwelling of God in the hearts of believers accomplished by him, he afterwards transfers what he had said to them of the coming of this Spirit, to his own coming to them in spirit. He points them to the great day, on which he would see them again in spirit, when the transient pain of separation from him would be succeeded by the everlasting joy of seeing him again and communing with him; when they would need no more to ask him questions, but he would speak to them concerning the Father openly and without reserve. But though John dwells at length on the spiritual element and on what relates to the revelation of Christ in the self-consciousness of the disciples, he by no means excludes his bodily resurrection and his own prediction of it; John x. 18. And thus from this scheme of doctrine it cannot be concluded, that John had not learned from the discourses of Christ the doctrine of his personal coming (*παρουσία*) to judgment and for the consummation of his church. The contrary rather follows from what we have already remarked respecting the connexion in John's views of the judgment and the resurrection, ac-

* But we have in the *Life of Christ*, pp. 429, 430, proved the opinion to be unfounded, that according to John's Gospel, only *one* such reappearance of Christ immediately followed his resurrection, and that the other reappearances of Christ took place after his ascension to heaven.

according to two distinct modes of apprehending them. And what John says in his First Epistle of the signs of the last time, the marks of an impending manifestation of an opposition to Christianity, points to the same fundamental ideas respecting the development of the kingdom of God as those that occur in Paul's epistles. There are not wanting also some intimations of an approaching personal *παρουσία* of Christ, (1 John ii. 28, iii. 2,) though the peculiarity of John's character is shown by his only giving slight hints on the subject, and not, like Paul, a formal delineation of it.

It belongs also to this peculiar tendency of John's mind, that Christ is not represented by him as the founder of a Church; even the idea of an *ἐκκλησία* is not distinctly brought forward, though its existence is implied, 3 John, 6. But what constitutes the essence of the idea of a church, the idea of a communion of hearts founded in faith on the Redeemer, of the communion of believers with one another and with the Redeemer, a communion of faith and love, was expressed by him most emphatically—for this idea would necessarily proceed from that which was the soul of his whole life, the consciousness of communion with the Redeemer, and of the divine life received from him.

Thus we find in John's Gospel a reference to a religious community, to be formed out of all others among mankind, which would listen to the voice of the Redeemer, the "one fold under one Shepherd," a communion which would be founded on the equal relation of all to Christ the common head, and corresponds to the Pauline idea of one body under one head, John x. 16. As Christ and the Father are one, so are believers, since through him they are one with the Father, by virtue of their mutual participation in the divine life. Thus they form a union to which no other in the world is comparable, and the glory of Christ reveals itself among them. They constitute before the eyes of the world a living testimony to the divine call and work of Christ. The communion of the divine life thus manifested, points to its divine origin, John xvii. 21. John also distinguishes between an *inward* community—the assemblage of those who stand in communion with the Redeemer, and which embraces the whole development of the divine life among mankind—and an *outward* community of believers, which it is possible for those to join who have no part in the former. Thus in 1 John ii. 19, he speaks of those who went out from the believers, but in fact (as far as it regarded their principles and disposition) never belonged to them, for had they really belonged to them in their inward life, they would not afterwards have renounced their society. But by this outwardly expressed renunciation, by their open opposition to the community of believers, it now became manifest that not all who were outwardly joined to that community shared in its essential qualities, and inwardly belonged to it. We find here, as in Paul's writings, the implied distinction of the visible and the invisible church.

John does not mention in his Gospel the institution of Baptism by

Christ, but he treats at length of that which forms the idea, the spiritual element of baptism—for to this the conversation between Christ and Nicodemus relates—that moral transformation by a new divine principle of life, in opposition to the old sinful nature of man, without which no one can become a member of the kingdom of God, that is, of the invisible church.*

And this also applies to the Holy Supper. For as what Christ in his conversation with Nicodemus designated by the name of regeneration, has a relation to Baptism, so what he represents in the sixth chapter of John, under the image of "eating his flesh and drinking his blood," bears a similar relation to the Supper. Christ had described himself as the true manna, the true bread from heaven, the bread which is not of an earthly, perishable nature, with only an earthly power to recruit the bodily life, but which is of divine origin and nature, capable of imparting divine life, and of satisfying the wants of the inner man for an eternal duration. He describes himself as having come down from heaven, in reference to his whole being, in order to impart divine life to mankind, so that every one can only by communion with the divine fountain of life thus appearing in human nature, attain to a participation of a divine life. From stating what he *is* to mankind in his whole divine and human nature, Christ goes on to declare what he will *give* to mankind for their salvation, (corresponding to the bestowment of the manna which was sought for from him)—the surrender of his flesh (his life belonging to the sensuous world) for the salvation of mankind. And since his words were so misunderstood by the Jews, as if he had spoken of eating his flesh in a literal sense, he took occasion to express what he had before said of himself as the bread of life, in even stronger terms, under an image still more striking, and marking the idea still more accurately; he represented the eating of his flesh and the drinking of his blood as a necessary means for the appropriation of eternal life. This eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood he considers equivalent to the *life of men*, by which the fountain of divine life itself enters into mankind, makes them entirely its own, as if men had converted into their own substance the flesh and blood of the incarnate Logos. He here speaks of the participation of divine life by means of his appearance in humanity, of the impartation of divine life depending upon and accomplished by the historical Christ, while he guards himself against being supposed to speak of his body in a literal sense, by saying, as a key for the right interpretation of his words, "*The spirit giveth life—the flesh profiteth nothing*;" therefore, he could not have intended to say, that men should make use of his flesh as an object of sense, for, like all flesh, it could not profit the

* On any supposition, the mention of "*water*" in John iii. 5, is only of secondary importance, in order, by referring to a symbol familiar to Nicodemus, to render palpable to his mind that all-purifying power of the Divine Spirit which was needful for every man. Hence, in the subsequent part of his discourse, Christ mentions only being "*born of the Spirit*."

inner man, but that by means of his appearing in the flesh in the world of sense, they should appropriate his spirit as the life-giving principle. "The words that I say unto you, are spirit and life;" they cannot be rightly understood according to their mere sound, their literal expression, but only according to their contents, which are spirit and life, possessing a divine vitality.* Therefore, the symbol, "eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ," relates to the process of imbuing the whole nature of every one who is received by faith into his communion with the divine principle of life, which, through him, has become a human principle in all who stand in communion with him; the constant humanizing of the divine in which continued appropriation and imbuing, the whole development of the Christian life consists. As regeneration, the commencing point in the Christian life, is represented by baptism, so is this, the sequel of regeneration, the continual re-birth (as it were) of man to the divine, the continued incorporation of mankind into the body of Christ, represented by the Supper. Thus John and Paul† agree, and on this subject complete each other's views.

The essence of Christianity, according to John, is comprised in this, that the Father is known only in the Son, and only through the Son can man come into communion with the Father; 1 John ii. 23; 2 John 9. But no one can be in communion with the Son without partaking of the Holy Spirit whom he bestows in order to renew human nature in his own image, 1 John iii. 24. Both John and Paul place the essence of Christian theism in worshipping God as the Father through the Son, in the communion of the divine life which he has established, or in the communion of the Holy Spirit, the Father through the Son dwelling in mankind, animated by his Spirit, agreeably to the triad of the Pauline benediction,—the love of God, the grace of Christ, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, (2 Cor. xiii. 13); and this is the basis of the doctrine of the Trinity in the connexion of Christian experience. It has an essentially practical and historical significance and foundation; it is the doctrine of God revealed in humanity, which teaches men to recognise in God not only the original source of existence, but also of salvation and sanctification. From this Trinity of revelation, as far as the divine causality images itself in the same, the reflective mind, according to the analogy of its own being, pursuing this track, seeks to elevate itself to the idea of an original triad in God, availing itself of the intimations which are contained in John's doctrine of the Logos, and the cognate elements of the Pauline theology.

As, accordingly, James and Peter mark the gradual transition from

* We cannot agree with those who think that Christ has here given the interpretation of his own words, and that he wished to say that, by his flesh and blood, nothing more was to be understood than his doctrine in reference to divine life-giving power. By "flesh," *σὰρξ*, and "blood," *αἷμα*, he certainly meant, according to what has been said, more than his "words," *ῥήματα*. These words of Christ contain only the canon of correct interpretation, and leave the application to each one for himself.

† See page 452.

spiritualized Judaism to the independent development of Christianity, and as Paul represents the independent development of Christianity in opposition to Jewish conceptions, so the reconciling contemplative element of John forms the closing-point in the training of the apostolic church, and now, from the classical era of original Christianity, we must trace a new tedious development of the church, striving towards its destined goal through manifold trials, oppositions, and conflicts. Perhaps this greater process of development is destined to proceed according to the same laws which we find prefigured in the fundamental forms of the Apostolic Church, in their relation to one another and in the order of their development.

INDEXES.

I.

INDEX TO TEXTS QUOTED OR EXPLAINED.

OLD TESTAMENT.

GENESIS.		NUMBERS.		ISAIAH.	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Ch. vi. 2.....	460	Ch. vi.....	283	Ch. ix. 6.....	462
xii. 3.....	40			xi. 2.....	17
xv. 6.....	419, 499	DEUTERONOMY.		lxvi. 1 ff.....	55
xviii. 18.....	40	iv. 19.....	298		
xxii. 18.....	40	xviii. 15, 18.....	40	JOEL.	
		xxx. 12.....	422	iii. 1-5.....	19
EXODUS.					
xii. 2.....	8	PSALMS.			
xix. 1.....	8	xviii. 5, 6.....	19	HABAKKUK.	
xxiv.....	363	lxviii. 18.....	304	ii. 4.....	499
		cxviii. 22.....	42		

NEW TESTAMENT.

MATTHEW.		<i>Matthew continued.</i>		<i>Luke continued.</i>	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Ch. i. 25.....	323	Ch. xxii. 44.....	461	Ch. ix. 51.....	7
iii. 11.....	374	xxvi. 60, 61.....	52	xi. 23 f.....	209
iv. 22.....	355	xxvii. 56.....	322, 354	xi. 34-36.....	407
v. 3 f.....	407	xxviii. 1.....	322	xiii. 14.....	34
v. 17.....	383, 505	xxviii. 18, 20.....	461	xvii. 10.....	434
vi. 22, 23.....	407			xviii. 16.....	407
ix. 13.....	406	MARK.		xviii. 18 f.....	407
x. 10.....	178	i. 20.....	354	xx. 2.....	41
xi. 27.....	461	iii. 17.....	356	xxi. 15.....	16
xi. 28.....	407	iii. 31.....	322	xxiii. 34, 46.....	56
xii. 46 f.....	322	v. 22.....	34	xxiv. 53.....	9
xiii. 33.....	406	vi. 3.....	322		
xiii. 55.....	322	xv. 40.....	322, 354	JOHN.	
xv. 11.....	128	xvi. 1.....	354	368—371.	
xv. 17.....	233	xvi. 17.....	16	i. 1 f.....	369 f
xvi. 16 f.....	340 f.			i. 4, 5.....	509
xvii. 20.....	145	LUKE.		i. 7-14.....	510
xviii. 10.....	407	i. 2.....	4	i. 12.....	511
xix. 8.....	400	iv. 20.....	32	i. 14.....	369, 514
xix. 11, 12.....	234	v. 32.....	406	i. 29.....	517
xix. 12.....	235	vii. 3.....	34	i. 32.....	515
xix. 14.....	407	viii. 19 f.....	322	i. 37.....	355
xix. 16 f.....	407	viii. 41, 49.....	34	i. 40.....	355
xx. 20.....	355			i. 43.....	338
xx. 28.....	417				
xxi. 42.....	41				

John continued

PAGE

Ch. i. 52.....	72
ii. 11.....	515
ii. 23.....	516, 520
iii.....	522, 529
iii. 5.....	529
iii. 6.....	511
iii. 8.....	6
iii. 17.....	525
iii. 21.....	76, 514
iv. 6.....	355
iv. 14.....	518, 524
iv. 22.....	111
v.....	526
v. 26.....	516
v. 28, 29.....	526
vi.....	529, 530
vi. 29.....	519
vi. 44, 45.....	512
vi. 45.....	515
vi. 51.....	517
vi. 50, 58.....	529
vi. 63.....	529
vi. 68.....	516
vi. 68, 69.....	340
vii. 3.....	323
vii. 5.....	325
vii. 38.....	518
vii. 39.....	518
viii. 31.....	521
viii. 44.....	510
viii. 47.....	513
ix. 39, 40.....	525
x.....	341
x. 16.....	528
x. 18.....	527
xii. 24.....	6, 518
xii. 31.....	409
xii. 32.....	518
xii. 40.....	512
xiii. 31.....	514, 517
xv.....	522
xvi. 11.....	409
xvi. 13.....	48
xvi. 14.....	527
xvi. 33.....	520
xvii. 1-5.....	518
xvii. 19.....	517
xvii. 21 f.....	528
xviii. 37.....	513
xix. 25.....	322, 354
xix. 27.....	323
xix. 34.....	369
xx. 21, 22.....	7
xx. 30, 31.....	368
xxi.....	341
xxi. 18.....	348

ACTS.

i. 7.....	180
i. 13.....	9, 322, 326
i. 14.....	322

Acts continued

PAGE

Ch. i. 26.....	9
ii. 1-41.....	5-20
ii. 1.....	7
ii. 2-6.....	10, 11
ii. 4.....	15
ii. 5.....	8
ii. 6, 11.....	14
ii. 7-12.....	15
ii. 8.....	11
ii. 9.....	8
ii. 12, 13.....	15
ii. 14.....	8, 9
ii. 15.....	9, 15
ii. 24.....	19
ii. 39.....	19, 20
ii. 42.....	23
ii. 43.....	38
ii. 44, 45.....	23-26
ii. 46.....	23, 131
ii. 47.....	27
iii. i-iv. 22.....	39-43
iv. 1.....	38
iv. 4.....	43, 44
iv. 5.....	42
iv. 7, 11, 16.....	41
iv. 32, 35.....	23-26
iv. 36.....	35
v. 1-11.....	25, 26
v. 2.....	30
v. 4.....	24
v. 6, 10.....	30
v. 12-42.....	42-46
v. 12, 13.....	26
v. 19 f.....	43, 44
v. 32.....	44
v. 36.....	45, 46
vi.....	24, 29
vi. 1-6.....	30-33
vi. 1.....	31
vi. 2.....	30
vi. 3.....	32
vi. 5-7.....	47
vi. 7.....	43
vi. 8-vii. 60.....	46-57
vi. 9.....	48
vi. 11.....	49
viii. 1-25.....	57-63
viii. 5.....	60
viii. 20, 21, 22.....	63
ix.....	86, 89
ix. 1-25.....	85-93
ix. 7.....	89
ix. 19, 23.....	92
ix. 23, 24.....	94
ix. 26-30.....	86-103
ix. 27.....	324
ix. 31.....	69
x. 1-11; xviii.....	66-77
x. 3.....	72
x. 11.....	74
x. 12.....	89
x. 30.....	71

Acts continued

PAGE

Ch. x. 37.....	71
x. 46.....	16
xi. 5.....	74
xi. 17.....	77
xi. 19-30.....	104-106
xi. 20.....	65
xi. 30.....	29, 32
xii.....	106-112
xii. 1.....	107
xii. 12.....	25
xiii. 9.....	80
xiii. 13.....	80
xiii. 14.....	111-119
xiii. 15.....	34, 36
xiii. 39.....	114
xiii. 42.....	114
xiii. 44.....	115
xiv. 6.....	119
xiv. 11.....	12
xiv. 13, 14.....	118
xiv. 17.....	392
xiv. 23.....	146, 148, 197
xv. 1-31.....	120, 134
xv. 7.....	125
xv. 10.....	404
xv. 12.....	125
xv. 19, 20.....	127-129
xv. 21.....	127, 505
xv. 22.....	125
xv. 22-24.....	131
xv. 23-29.....	130-132
xv. 23.....	131
xv. 25.....	103
xv. 27.....	131
xv. 28.....	131
xv. 29.....	132
xv. 36-xviii. 17.....	167-201
xvi. 1.....	168
xvi. 1, 2.....	168
xvi. 3.....	169
xvi. 10, 13.....	173
xvi. 16.....	174
xvii. 6.....	181
xvii. 10.....	182
xvii. 14.....	182
xvii. 16.....	190
xvii. 21.....	183
xvii. 22.....	185
xvii. 28.....	390
xvii. 30.....	189, 402, 415
xvii. 31, 32.....	189
xviii. 2.....	203
xviii. 5.....	190
xviii. 8.....	34
xviii. 9.....	89
xviii. 15.....	193
xviii. 18.....	34
xviii. 18-xix. 40.....	202-274
xviii. 18, 22.....	202, 203
xviii. 21.....	202, 203
xviii. 23.....	241
xviii. 24.....	220

<i>Acts continued.</i>	
	PAGE
Ch. xviii. 26.....	203
xix. 1.....	211, 241
xix. 6.....	16, 36
xix. 15.....	209
xix. 20.....	254
xix. 22.....	250, 309
xix. 29.....	168
xix. 33.....	320
xx.-xxiv.....	274-289
xx. 3.....	182
xx. 4.....	168
xx. 7.....	159
xx. 17.....	147, 148
xx. 20.....	275
xx. 22.....	275
xx. 23.....	275, 314
xx. 25-31.....	274-276
xx. 28.....	148
xx. 29.....	277
xx. 30.....	277
xx. 31.....	275
xx. 31, 33.....	278
xx. 34.....	179
xx. 35.....	179, 278
xx. 36-38.....	279
xxi. 8.....	33
xxi. 9.....	150
xxi. 19.....	272
xxi. 20.....	280
xxi. 21.....	272, 505
xxi. 24.....	282
xxi. 25.....	245
xxi. 27.....	282
xxi. 39.....	80
xxii.....	86, 89
xxii. 3.....	80
xxii. 17.....	89
xxii. 21.....	103
xxiii. 3.....	283
xxiii. 5.....	284
xxiii. 9.....	285
xxiii. 14.....	203
xxiv. 11.....	282
xxiv. 17.....	272
xxiv. 27.....	285
xxv.-xxviii.....	286-289
xxv. 19.....	185
xxvi.....	86, 89
xxvi. 28.....	287
xxviii. 16.....	288
xxviii. 22.....	288
xxviii. 23.....	288
xxviii. 30.....	288
xxviii. 30, 31.....	288, 289
ROMANS.	
262-271.	
i. 3, 4.....	468
i. 4.....	467
i. 5, 6.....	263
i. 8.....	262

<i>Romans continued.</i>	
	PAGE
Ch. i. 12.....	135
i. 13, 14.....	263
i. 16.....	111, 167, 183
i. 18.....	401, 404
i. 19.....	187, 393
i. 20, 21.....	392
i. 21, 25.....	187
i. 28.....	393
i. 32.....	393, 402
ii. 1.....	393
ii. 4.....	348
ii. 9.....	167, 393
ii. 14-26.....	403
ii. 15.....	283
ii. 29.....	306
iii. 8.....	330
iii. 20.....	392
iii. 21.....	423
iii. 25.....	189, 402, 415
iii. 28.....	346
iv. 15.....	403
iv. 18.....	420
iv. 19 f.....	419 f
iv. 20.....	419
iv. 22.....	419
iv. 25.....	113, 411
v. 4.....	437
v. 5.....	434
v. 7.....	382
v. 8.....	412
v. 9.....	417
v. 10.....	412, 414
v. 12.....	390, 391
v. 13.....	261, 415
v. 13, 14.....	402
v. 18.....	409
v. 18, 19.....	410
v. 19-21.....	430
v. 20.....	54, 399, 400
vi. 1.....	330
vi. 2.....	428
vi. 4.....	151, 451
vi. 4-6.....	427
vi. 5-8.....	480
vi. 6.....	385
vi. 10.....	411
vi. 11.....	480
vi. 11-13.....	429
vii.....	396, 398, 428
vii. 2, 4.....	423
vii. 5.....	385
vii. 9 f.....	389
vii. 10, 11.....	396
vii. 12.....	382, 385
vii. 13.....	400
vii. 15.....	429
vii. 22.....	395
vii. 24.....	91
vii. 25.....	397
viii. 2.....	422
viii. 3.....	408, 466, 469
viii. 5.....	384

<i>Romans continued.</i>	
	PAGE
Ch. viii. 10.....	482
viii. 11 f.....	430
viii. 13.....	429
viii. 15.....	426
viii. 16.....	434
viii. 18.....	346
viii. 19-23.....	480
viii. 23.....	417, 435, 436
viii. 24.....	437, 440
viii. 26.....	436
viii. 28 f.....	478
viii. 31, 32.....	430
viii. 32.....	412
viii. 38.....	460
ix.....	474-479
ix. 4.....	401
ix. 5.....	466
ix. 8.....	421
ix. 30, 31.....	404, 477
x. 3.....	404
x. 5-10.....	421, 422
x. 6.....	304
xi.....	266
xi. 12.....	112
xi. 13.....	263
xi. 14.....	112, 122
xi. 17, 18.....	265
xi. 18.....	456
xi. 20.....	477
xi. 22.....	486
xi. 32.....	405, 475, 486
xi. 33.....	144, 475
xi. 33-36.....	266
xii. 1.....	134, 427
xii. 3.....	430, 444
xii. 6.....	431
xii. 7.....	145
xii. 7, 8.....	303
xii. 8.....	152, 276
xii. 9, 10.....	138
xiii. 7.....	446
xiii. 8.....	424
xiii. 9.....	385
xiii. 11.....	417
xiv.....	262
xiv. 1.....	431
xiv. 1-6.....	158
xiv. 2.....	267, 270, 431
xiv. 3.....	267
xiv. 6.....	268
xiv. 15.....	433
xiv. 16.....	458
xiv. 17.....	233, 271, 433, 458
xiv. 21.....	267, 270
xiv. 23.....	443
xiv.-xv.....	262 f
xv. 7.....	262, 271
xv. 15.....	265
xv. 19.....	261
xv. 20.....	168
xv. 24, 28.....	250
xv. 31.....	276

Romans, continued.

	PAGE
Ch. xv. 31, 32	274
xvi. 1.....	146, 155
xvi. 3.....	194, 203
xvi. 4.....	256
xvi. 7.....	323
xvi. 14, 15.....	153
xvi. 17.....	262, 271
xvi. 19.....	262
xvi. 23, 153, 168, 229, 309	

I. CORINTHIANS.

243—251.

i. 2	243
i. 5	237
i. 11, 12	242
i. 12	218, 222, 224
i. 13.....	223
i. 14	168
i. 16.....	195
i. 1-18	243
i. 22, 23.....	261, 405
i. 23.....	183
i. 26	194, 229
i. 29, 30	303
ii. 4	195, 261
ii. 6	144
ii. 11.....	230
ii. 14.....	386, 394, 438
iii. 6, 7.....	221
iii. 9, 10	136
iii. 11.....	448
iii. 11-15.....	244
iii. 12	221
iii. 16, 17	221, 245
iii. 18.....	183, 405
iii. 21.....	243
iii. 22.....	432
iv. 7	443
iv. 8-19.....	251
iv. 9.....	460
iv. 17	250
iv. 20	237, 458
v. 3	258
v. 3-5.....	149
v. 5.....	252, 261
v. 7.....	159
v. 9-11.....	242
v. 11.....	231
vi. 5	146, 149
vi. 7.....	251
vi. 9.....	231, 449
vi. 10	458
vi. 11.....	194, 452
vi. 12.....	232, 246, 432
vi. 12, 13.....	233
vi. 14	480
vi. 15	304
vii. 14.....	164, 165
vii. 18.....	281

1st Corinthians, continued

	PAGE
Ch. vii. 20-22.....	248
vii. 21 f.....	242, 432
vii. 22.....	425
vii. 23, 24	248, 249
vii. 24	123
vii. 29, 30	247
vii. 40	235
viii. 2	438
viii. 5	470
viii. 6.....	464
viii. 7.....	231, 470
viii. 8	233
viii. 11.....	232
viii. 12.....	433
ix. 1.....	89
ix. 1, 2.....	228
ix. 1-19	432
ix. 5.....	235, 342, 343
ix. 5 f.....	323
ix. 6.....	168
ix. 14.....	178
ix. 14, 15 f.....	433
ix. 16-18.....	178
ix. 20.....	123, 159
ix. 21.....	425
ix. 23.....	460
x. 1	251
x. 3, 4.....	455
x. 4	465
x. 9.....	465
x. 14 f	455
x. 17.....	455
x. 19, 20.....	470
x. 23.....	233, 432
x. 24	432, 433
x. 27-29.....	231, 232
x. 31	432, 433
xi. 5	150
xi. 10.....	460
xi. 19.....	277
xi. 23	101
xi. 24.....	453
xi. 25	454
xi. 26.....	453
xi. 29.....	454
xii.	451
xii. 1 f	135
xii. 3.....	449
xii. 4	460
xii. 7.....	136
xii. 8	143
xii. 9.....	145
xii. 9, 10.....	138
xii. 11.....	136
xii. 13.....	160, 452, 455
xii. 28..33, 145, 152, 276, 303.	
xiii.....	137
xiii. 2.....	143, 145
xiii. 4, 5.....	446
xiii. 9-12.....	439
xiii. 13.....	439

1st Corinthians, continued

	PAGE
Ch. xiv. 14.....	394
xiv. 14-16.....	141
xiv. 20.....	407, 445
xiv. 21-24.....	139, 140
xiv. 25.....	140
xiv. 26	152
xiv. 30, 31.....	142
xiv. 34.....	150
xv.	237, 480, 484
xv. 6.....	43
xv. 7.....	324, 326
xv. 8.....	89
xv. 17.....	411
xv. 19.....	436
xv. 22.....	486
xv. 23, 24	486
xv. 24.....	460
xv. 27, 28.....	485, 486
xv. 29.....	163
xv. 30.....	249
xv. 30, 31.	256
xv. 31, 32.....	255
xv. 32-35.....	238, 239
xv. 33.....	230
xv. 45.....	392
xv. 46.....	389
xv. 46, 47.....	391
xv. 55-58.....	485
xv. 56.....	392
xvi. 2.....	158, 159
xvi. 4.....	273
xvi. 5.....	251
xvi. 7.....	241
xvi. 8.....	249
xvi. 9.....	359
xvi. 10.....	250
xvi. 12.....	249
xvi. 13.....	445
xvi. 15.....	156, 162, 195
xvi. 15, 16	146, 276
xvi. 20.....	153

II. CORINTHIANS.

257—260.

i. 1.....	195
i. 5.....	256
i. 8.....	256
i. 12	445
i. 12, 13.....	259
i. 15.....	258
i. 16.....	251
i. 16-22	260
i. 22.....	435
ii. 1.....	240
ii. 5.....	252
ii. 5-10.....	257, 258
ii. 6.....	252
ii. 10-11	472
ii. 16.....	526

<i>2d Corinthians, continued</i>	
	PAGE
Ch. iii. 6 f	422
iv. 4.	467
iv. 7	256
iv. 9	256
iv. 10.	256
iv. 11.	256
iv. 16.	395, 482
v. 4	391, 392
v. 6-8.	484
v. 7	440
v. 9	256
v. 10.	505
v. 12.	228
v. 13.	260
v. 16.	83
v. 16, 17.	228
v. 17.	449
v. 18.	412
v. 20.	412, 413, 414
v. 21.	410
vi. 9.	256
vii. 2.	207
vii. 5.	256
vii. 8-12.	252
vii. 9.	252
vii. 11.	258
vii. 14.	253
viii.	257
viii. 9.	465, 469
viii. 13.	24
viii. 18.	259
viii. 19.	156
ix.	262
ix. 12-15.	273
x. 7.	224, 228
x. 10.	258
x. 14-16.	261
x. 16.	168, 250
xi.	218
xi. 4, 5	227
xi. 5	346
xi. 6.	82, 222
xi. 9.	197, 350
xi. 18	228
xi. 21	260
xi. 22	80
xi. 25	177
xi. 26, 27.	203
xi. 29.	212, 278
xi. 30.	93
xi. 32.	93, 94
xii. 2.	88
xii. 7.	256
xii. 7, 10.	171
xii. 12	194, 254
xii. 13, 14	240
xii. 18	250
xii. 20, 21.	240
xiii. 1	240
xiii. 4.	84, 411
xiii. 6, 8.	260
xiii. 13.	530

<i>Galatians.</i>	
GALATIANS.	
212—217.	
	PAGE
Ch. i.	99
i. 1.	88, 89
i. 4.	457
i. 6.	207
i. 9.	207
i. 10.	214
i. 12.	101
i. 12-16.	89
i. 14.	83
i. 17.	93
i. 18.	94
i. 18-24.	94-103
i. 19.	323
i. 21.	130
ii. 1-10.	107 f. 119-134
ii. 2.	109, 121
ii. 4-6.	124
ii. 5.	125
ii. 9.	124, 356
ii. 10.	218
ii. 11-17, 204-206, 341, 342	
ii. 11-18.	67
ii. 12.	279
ii. 14.	506
ii. 18.	205
ii. 19.	423
ii. 20.	387, 428
iii. 2, 5.	211
iii. 5.	215, 449
iii. 10.	383
iii. 12.	502
iii. 13.	404, 410
iii. 14.	404
iii. 15.	399
iii. 18.	399
iii. 19.	261, 399
iii. 21.	383
iii. 23.	400
iii. 24.	400
iii. 26-28.	448
iii. 27.	160, 451, 452
iii. 28.	236, 427
iv. 2.	261
iv. 4.	7, 405, 464
iv. 5.	436
iv. 6.	426, 464
iv. 8.	426, 470
iv. 9	401, 426
iv. 9 f.	135, 157
iv. 12.	215
iv. 14.	172
iv. 16.	208
iv. 18-20.	208
iv. 21.	473-475
iv. 26.	457
iv. 29.	473
v. 2, 3.	207
v. 5.	437

<i>Galatians, continued.</i>	
	PAGE
Ch. v. 6.	427
v. 11.	217
v. 12.	213, 306
v. 13.	267, 329
v. 16-19.	428, 429
v. 20.	231, 316, 386
v. 21.	207, 329
v. 22, 23.	424
v. 24.	428
v. 25.	428
v. 26.	154
vi. 6.	154
vi. 6, 7.	154
vi. 11.	214
vi. 12.	216, 217
vi. 12, 13.	213
vi. 13.	213
vi. 14.	217
vi. 17.	217, 218
EPHESIANS.	
302—305.	
i. 1.	305
i. 4.	405, 479
i. 10.	7, 405
i. 14.	417
i. 18.	438
i. 23.	300
ii. 2.	470
ii. 8-10.	303
ii. 9, 10.	435
ii. 10.	384
ii. 12.	262
ii. 14.	48
ii. 14, 16.	459
ii. 19, 20.	456
ii. 20.	302, 448
iii. 3.	207, 304
iii. 5.	302
iii. 9.	405
iii. 10.	71, 144, 476
iii. 15.	459
iii. 16, 17.	395
iii. 17.	434
iii. 19.	300, 412
iv. 2.	444
iv. 4.	448
iv. 8.	304, 471
iv. 11.	146, 150, 152, 302
iv. 16.	145, 450
iv. 19.	403
iv. 24.	390
iv. 25.	506
iv. 28.	304
v. 5, 6.	207
v. 6	166, 180, 329
v. 14.	304
v. 15 f.	445
v. 23.	304
v. 25 f.	246
v. 25 26	374

Ephesians, continued.

	PAGE
Ch. v. 26 f.	452
vi. 2, 3.	304
vi. 11.	472
vi. 12.	472
vi. 21.	304

PHILIPPIANS.

302—305.

i. 1.....	146, 148,	306
i. 7.....		309
i. 15-18		292
i. 18.....		293
i. 20... .		319
i. 21.....		483
i. 21-24.....		391
i. 23.....		483
ii. 3.....		444
ii. 4-7		306
ii. 5-9.....		468
ii. 6		411
ii. 7.....		468
ii. 10, 11.....		486
ii. 12.....		443
iii. 2, 3.....		305
iii. 3.....		427
iii. 5.....		80
iii. 6	83, 382,	384
iii. 9-15.....		306
iii. 11-12.....		305
iii. 12	318, 430,	433
iii. 15.....		99, 305
iv. 3.....		306
iv. 12, 13		171
iv. 16.....	179,	197
iv. 22.....	291,	292

COLOSSIANS.

293—302.

i. 6.....	170
i. 7.....	170
i. 9.....	438
i. 15.....	468
i. 16.....	467
i. 18.....	467
i. 19.....	300
i. 20.....	460, 487
ii. 1.....	170
ii. 5.....	170
ii. 8.....	294, 295, 297
ii. 9.....	300
ii. 11.....	385
ii. 14.....	385
ii. 15.....	471
ii. 16.....	158
ii. 18.....	301, 386
ii. 20.....	297
iii. 2.....	429
iii. 3.....	427
iii. 4.....	437
iii. 5.....	429

Colossians, continued.

	PAGE
Ch. iii. 10.	390
iii. 11.	448
iii. 12.	444
iii. 14.	446
iv. 1.	446
iv. 5.	444, 445
iv. 8.	302
iv. 10.	353
iv. 11.	292
iv. 12.	294
iv. 14.	173
iv. 15.	153
iv. 16.	198

I. THESSALONIANS.

196—198.

i. 3	435, 438
i. 7, 8	195
i. 9	196
i. 9, 10	178
ii. 9	179
ii. 10, 11	178
ii. 12	180, 458
ii. 14, 15	198
ii. 18	181
iii. 1	190, 191
iv. 6	207
iv. 8	180
iv. 9	423
iv. 13	196, 197
iv. 17	484
v. 12	146, 197
v. 19	196
v. 21	143
v. 21-23	199
v. 23	394
v. 27	198

II. THESSALONIANS

200—201.

i. 4.....	196, 438
i. 5.....	458
i. 7-9.....	485
ii. 2.....	199
iii. 2.....	200
iii. 17.....	199

I. TIMOTHY.

312—314.

i. 4313, 314,	316
i. 9	313
i. 20	319
ii. 7	313
ii. 12	150
ii. 15	314
iii. 1147,	313
iii. 6	197
iii. 833,	148
iii. 15	313

1st Timothy, continued.

	PAGE
Ch. iv. 1.	314
iv. 8.	313
iv. 12.	315
v. 3-16	155
v. 17, 18.	313
vi. 12.	162

П. ТИМОТНУ.

317—320.

i. 5.....	168
i. 6.....	156
i. 7.....	444
i. 15.....	310
ii. 3.....	472
ii. 9.....	317
ii. 17.....	308
ii. 19, 20.....	450, 457
ii. 21.....	478
ii. 22.....	315
ii. 23.....	317
iv. 5.....	151
iv. 6—8.....	318
iv. 7, 8.....	319
iv. 13.....	309
iv. 14.....	319
iv. 16.....	369
iv. 17.....	318, 319
iv. 18.....	483
iv. 19.....	203
iv. 20.....	309

TITUS.

315—317.

i. 5.....	148
i. 5 f.....	156
i. 5-7.....	148
i. 9.....	154
ii. 6.....	444
ii. 12.....	444
ii. 15.....	315
iii. 2.....	316
iii. 4.....	412
iii. 5.....	452
iii. 9.....	316
iii. 10.....	316

PHILEMON.

293.

Verse 22..... 293
23..... 294

HEBREWS.

320, 487-498.

Ch. ii. 3.....	488
ii. 14.....	492
iii. 6.....	495
iii. 12.....	488
iii. 14.....	495

<i>Hebrews, continued.</i>		<i>James, continued.</i>		<i>1st John, continued.</i>	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Ch. iv. 12.....	498	Ch. i. 27.....	132	Ch. iv. 1.....	360
v. 7.....	492	ii. 7.....334,	335	iv. 4.....	521
v. 7, 8.....	494	ii. 8.....	503	iv. 10.....	517
v. 12.....297,	426	ii. 13.....	504	iv. 10-19.....	520
vi. 1.....	488	ii. 18.....	500	v. 3.....	520
vi. 4.....488,	489	ii. 26.....	500	v. 4.....	520
vi. 5.....	496	iii. 1 f.....	34	v. 16.....	523
vi. 19.....	496	iii. 1, 2.....	336	v. 18.....	521
vii. 19.....	489	iii. 2.....	504		
vii. 25, 26.....	494	iv. 7.....	507	II. JOHN.	
viii. 12.....	489	iv. 7, 8.....	507	375-376.	
ix. 9.....	491	v. 4.....	334	Verse 7.....	376
ix. 10.....	491	v. 12.....	506	9.....	530
ix. 14.....	489				
ix. 15.....	489	I. PETER.			
ix. 23.....	495	343-347.		III. JOHN.	
ix. 28.....494,	495	i. 5.....	417	Verse 6.....	528
x. 22.....491,	495	i. 8.....	344		
x. 23, 24.....	495	ii. 9.....	134	JUDE.	
x. 32.....	488	ii. 10.....	346	362-363.	
x. 36.....	495	iii. 21.....	161	Verse 1.....322,	362
xi.....	499	iv. 3.....	346	17.....	362
xi. 1.....	496	iv. 4, 5.....	345		
xi. 3.....	496	iv. 11.....138,	145	REVELATION.	
xi. 40.....	488	v. 1.....344,	347	365-367.	
xii. 2.....	496	v. 1, 2.....	147	Ch. i. 1..	366
xii. 22.....	496	v. 12.....	346	i. 2.....	367
xii. 23.....	491	v. 13.....	343	i. 9.....	367
xii. 28.....	489			i. 17.....	365
xiii. 7.....	36	II. PETER.		ii. 2.....	359
xiii. 9.....	488	347-348.		ii. 6 ..	360
xiii. 10.....	491	i. 14.....	348	ii. 9 ..	359
xiii. 13.....	491	i. 18.....	348	ii. 15....	360
xiii. 15.....	489	iii. 15.....	348	ii. 20.....	360
xiii. 17.....	36			ii. 24.....	360
xiii. 20.....	493	I. JOHN.		iii. 14.....	365
xiii. 23.....	320	371-375.		vi. 9.....	345
JAMES.		i. 2.....	514	vii. 4.....	365
327-337, 498-508.		i. 9.....	522	vii. 17 ..	365
i. 4.....	503	i. 10.....	512	xiii. 3.....	366
i. 6.....	326	ii. 19.....	528	xiv. 3.....	365
i. 9, 10.....	335	ii. 22.....	373	xvi. 12.....	366
i. 10.....	335	ii. 23.....	530	xvii. 6.....	345
i. 13-16.....	507	ii. 28.....	528	xvii. 8.....	366
i. 15.....	507	iii. 2.....	528	xvii. 16.....	366
i. 18.....	501	iii. 9.....	522	xix. 30.....	365
i. 19.....	336	iii. 16.....	520	xx. 4.....	345
i. 21.....	504	iii. 24.....	530	xxi. 14.....	366
i. 25.....302,	503				

II.

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS AND PHRASES.

- Ἀγαπαι, 23, 28, 249.
 ἄγγελοι, 55.
 ἄγια, 164.
 ἀδελφός του Χριστου, 223, 322.
 ἄγιοι, 448.
 ἄζυμοι, 160.
 ἀκαθάρτα, 164.
 ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖν, 445.
 αἰών οὗτος, 456, 457, 491.
 αἰών μελλων, 456, 457, 491.
 ἀληθείας, ἐκ της, εἶναι, 513.
 ἁμαρτια, 239, 399, 400.
 ἀναστοιχειωσις, 189.
 ἄνθρωπος λογικός, 220.
 ἀνοχή τοῦ θεοῦ, 415.
 ἀνδρεία, 445.
 ἀνδριζεσθαι, 445.
 ἀντιληψεις, 33, 141.
 ἀπιστος, 139.
 ἀποκαλύπτειν, 99.
 ἀποκαλυψις, 47, 99, 139, 142, 151.
 ἀποκαλυψεις κυρίου, 142.
 ἀπολύτρωσις, 477.
 Ἀρμυσται, 147.
 ἀρχαγγελος, 299.
 ἀρχισυναγωγος, 34, 148.
 Ἀσιαρχαι, 255.
 ἀφεις, 114, 415.
 Βαρναβας, 35.
 βαπτισμα, ἐν, 448.
 Γλωσσαις λαλεῖν, 11-18, 140-142.
 γνωσις, 47, 143, 313.
 Δειπνον κυρίου, 23.
 δεισιδαιμων, 185.
 δεισιδαιμονια, 185.
 διαθηκη, 8, 454.
 διακονια, 31.
 διακονοι, 29.
 διακονεῖν τραπεζαῖς, 31.
 διακρισις πνευματων, 142.
 διασπορα, 263.
 διδασκαλοι, } 35, 138, 140, 142, 152,
 διδασκαλια, } 303.
 διδαχη, 152.
 δικαίος, 382, 409, 416.
 δικαιοσύνη, 382, 418, 446, 523.
 δικαιοσύνη νομική, 382.
 δικαίον και ἴσον, 446.
 δικαίωμα, 409.
 δικαιωσις, 410, 417, 418, 523.
 δικη, 441.
 δοξα, 516.
 διορθωσις, 491.
 δουλεία, 425.
 δουλεία της ἁμαρτίας, 396.
 δουλευεῖν, 425.
 δυνατός τη πίστει, 430.
 Ἐαυτῷ ζην, 387.
 ἑβραῖος, 80.
 ἔθνη, 263.
 ἐκκλησία, 148, 448, 528.
 ἐκκλησία ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ, 153.
 ἐλεων, 145.
 ἐλληνιστής, 80.
 ἑλπις, 437.
 ἐπισκοποι, 147, 148.
 ἐπερωτημα, 161.
 ἔργα, 500.
 ἔργα νομου, 423, 435.
 ἔργα ἀγαθα, 423, 435.
 ἐρμηνεία, 17.
 ἐρμηνεία γλωσσων, 142.
 ἐρμηνεύς, 12.
 ἐρμηνευτής, 12.
 ἐρχεσθαι δι' αἵματος, δι' ὕδατος, 373, 374.
 εὐαγγελίσται, 151.
 εὐαγγέλιον πνευματικόν, 526.
 ἐφεσια γραμματα, 208.
 Ζεὺς, 118.
 ζωη, 382, 410.
 Ἅγιασμενοι, 448.
 ἡμέραι τινές, 92.
 ἡμέραι ἱκαναί, 92.
 Θησαυρίζων, 159.
 θεου, ἐκ, εἶναι, 513.

Ἰακωβου, τινες απο, 204.

Ἰδιώτης τῷ λογῷ, 82.

Ἰερουσαλημ, ἡ αὐτῇ, 457.

Ἰδιωται, 134.

Ἰκετης, 59, 497.

Ἰλασμος, 517.

Καιρος ενεστηκως, 491.

κατα προσωποι, 228.

κενοι λογοι, 160, 180.

κληρονομια, 436.

κλητοι, 449.

κοινωνια, 23.

κοσμος, 448.

κυβερνησεις, 152.

κυνες, 305.

Λογος, 59, 63, 369, 502.

λογος γνωσεως, 143-145.

λογος σοφιας, 143-145.

λαος, 263, 492.

Μαθηται, 211.

μακροθυμια, 445.

μεγαλοψυχια, 441.

μεταδιδους, 145.

μεταξυ, 114.

Νεωτεροι, 29.

νεανισκοι, 29.

νομος, 382, 422-425.

νομος τελειος, 502.

νους, 138, 141, 394.

Οικοδομειν, 136, 448.

οικουμενη, 105.

οικουμενη μελλουσα, 491.

οί τοῦ χριστου, 223, 224, 228, 230.

οί τοῦ Ἰακωβου, 223.

ὀπτασιαι, 142.

ὀργη, 416.

Παρεσις, 189, 415.

παρακλητος, 59.

παρουσις, 527, 528.

πειθαρχουντες, 44.

πηλικος, 214.

πολυποικιλος, 476.

πιστις, 47, 145, 431, 488.

πληρωμα, 300.

πληρωμα τοῦ χριστου, τῶν καιρων, 7.

πνευμα, 138, 141, 394, 395, 428.

πνευμα ἅγιον, 430.

ποιμενες, 152.

πρεσβυτεροι, 29, 33.

προσευχη, 173.

προσευχη Ἰωσηφ, 59.

προφητεiai, 35, 140.

προφητευειν, 16, 17.

πρωτον Ἰουδαιῳ, 111.

Ῥημα, 63.

Σαρξ, 386, 428.

σαρκικα, 163, 426.

σημεια, 188.

σκοτια, 509.

σοφια, 143, 144, 444, 445.

σοφian ζητειν, 192, 222, 386.

στοιχεia τοῦ κοσμου, 297, 401, 426.

στρατηγον, 175.

συμποσια φιλικα, 236.

συναγωγη, 334.

σωματικη γυμνασια, 313.

σωφρονειν, 444.

σωφροσυνη, 444, 446.

σωφρονισμος, 444.

σωτηρια, 417, 525.

Ταπεινοφροσυνη, 441.

ταπεινον, 441.

τελεια, 501.

τελειωσις, 496.

Υιος παρακλησεως, 35.

υιος του ανθρωπου, and υιος του θεου, 461.

υιος προφητειας, 35.

υιοθεσια, 425, 436.

υπερων, 9.

υπομονη, 438, 445.

Ψυχη, 138, 394, 395.

Φανεροῦν, 99.

φανερωσις τοῦ πνευματος, 136.

φιλοσοφια, 295, 313.

φρονησις, 446.

φρονιμος, 143.

Χαρισμα, 137.

χαρισμα κυβερνησεως, οἱ του προισταναι, 145, 341.

χαρισμα διακονιας, οἱ αντιληψεως, 145, 147.

χηραι, 155.

III.

GENERAL INDEX.

- ABRAHAM**, his faith, works, and righteousness, 215, 328, 419, 420-450; promises to, 40, 215, 399.
- Abyssinia**, introduction of the Gospel into, 64.
- Acts**, credibility of, in general, 1-4; in particulars, on account of their simplicity and artlessness, 25, 41, 43, 50, 68, 130, 283; as well as on account of single unhistorical features, 14, 18, 44, 45; credibility not destroyed by certain inexactnesses, 52, 96, 103; nor by evidence of its not being always founded on original accounts, 41, 42; but confirmed by many striking coincidences with the epistles of Paul, 94, 170, 189.
- Achaia**, Paul and the churches in, 191, 196, 200, 212, 241, 250, 261, 274, 312.
- Adam and Christ**, 408.
- Adiaphorism**, germs of a false, at Corinth, 232.
- Adoption**, threefold application of the idea of, 436.
- Agabus**, the prophet, foretells an approaching famine, 105.
- Agapæ**, or love-feasts, 23, 165, 236.
- Agrippa II.**, Paul's examination before, 286, 287.
- Alexander**, a Jew, at Ephesus, 255.
- Alexander**, of Abonoteichos, 112.
- Alexander**, the copper-smith, 319.
- Alexandrine Jewish theology**, its relation to the Epistle to the Hebrews, 496.
- Ananias**, a Jewish merchant, converts King Izates, 108.
- Ananias and Sapphira**, their fate, 26.
- Ananias**, high-priest, Paul's conduct before him, 283.
- Ananias**, of Damascus, 85, 92, 98.
- Ananus**, high-priest, 337.
- Angelic appearances under the new dispensation**, 44, 72.
- Angelolatry** professed by Jewish Christians, 299, 361.
- Angels**, the giving of the law through, 55.
- Antichrist**, 200, 366, 372.
- Antioch of Pisidia** visited by Paul and Barnabas, 118.
- Antioch**, in Syria, the Church there distinguished as the Gentile mother-church, 104; relation of the Church at, to the Church at Jerusalem, 105; Paul and the Church at, 104, 106, 110, 119, 167; meeting of Paul, Barnabas, and Peter at, 204; controversy between the Jewish and Gentile Christians, 119, 132.
- Apocalypse**, when written, 365; its author, 375.
- Apollo**, one of his prophetesses dispossessed by Paul, 174.
- Apollos**, an Alexandrine Jew, an anti-Pauline party at Corinth formed around him, 220, 227.
- Apollos**, one of John's disciples, 220.
- Apostolic Church**, sources of the history of the, 1-4.
- Apostles**, significance to them of the feast of Pentecost, 7; the only guides of the church at first, 30, 35; as distinguished from evangelists and teachers, 151; gradual release from old Testament forms, 27, 36, 48, 51, 62, 66, 122; not free from human weakness, 167, 204; possibility in them of an error *conversationalis* but not *doctrinæ*, 342; possible errors in matters not pertaining to faith, 175; not gifted with infallible foresight, 276; their progressive knowledge in Eschatology, 433, 484.
- Apostolic Council**, 121-131; importance of its decision, 132.
- Aquila**, 153, 192-194, 203, 220.
- Aquila and Priscilla**, a Christian society met in their house, 153; their interview with Paul at Corinth, 194.
- Arabia**, Paul in, 92.
- Aratus**, the poet, quoted by Paul, 188.
- Areopagus at Athens**, 184.
- Aretas**, king of Arabia, 84, 93, 94.
- Aristarchus**, 168, 294.
- Arnold (Dr.)**, his sermons quoted, 336.
- Artemis worshipped at Ephesus**, 208, 254.
- Artemonites**, 265.
- Asiarchs**, their office at Ephesus, 255.
- Athens visited by Paul**, 182; its altar dedicated to an unknown god, 186.
- Athinganians**, the, 300.
- Augustine**, Paul and Luther, 82.
- BABYLON**, Peter at, 343, 351.
- Baptism**, the rite of admission into the Christian Church, 21, 160; probably only one baptismal formula, 21, 160; performed by immersion, 161; practice of infant baptism unknown in the early Church, 162-164; substitutionary baptism for the dead, 163; its two-fold reference to the death and resurrection of Christ, 451.
- Barjesus**, an itinerant Jewish goëa, 112.
- Barnabas**, Paul's coadjutor, 97, 104; visits Antioch, 104; Cyprus, 111; Antioch in Pisidia, 113; separates from Paul, 167; weakness of, at Corinth, 204.
- Barsabas**, messenger from Jerusalem to Antioch, 130.
- Bartholomew's mission to India**, 102; takes Matthew's Gospel with him, 102.
- Beroea visited by Paul and Silas**, 182.
- Bishops**, overseers of the whole Church, 145, their duties, 148, 153.
- Brethren of Jesus**, 321-324; whether Jude, author of the epistle, was a brother of Jesus, 362.
- CÆSAREA STRATONIS**, Philip at, 64; Cornelius at, 69; Paul there on his way to Jerusalem, 279; Paul imprisoned there, 285.
- Caius**, the Roman presbyter, his testimony respecting the graves of Peter and Paul, 351.

- Cardinal virtues, the, of the ancients contemplated in relation to faith, hope, and love, 446.**
Cathedra Petri in Rome, 351.
Celibacy, its first manifestation, 233, 234; why recommended by Paul in certain cases, 235, 246.
Cerinthus, heretic, 299, 362.
Charisms, or gifts for the ministry of the word, 136-147; for the government of the Church, 147-153; the gift of working miracles, 145.
Children, the, of Christians, in what sense holy, 164.
Christ, his personal existence presupposed by the existence of the Church, 51; his incarnation, 514, 515; miracles, 516; various collections of his life and discourses possessed by his immediate disciples, 101; his speedy reappearance expected by the early Christians, 27, 157, 196, 199, 246, 347, 459; work of redemption accomplished by him, 408-411; his humiliation and glorification, 410; his sufferings, 410; his death, 410; and resurrection, 411; the Head of the Church, 463; the belief of his divinity essential to Christianity, 463; his victory over the kingdom of evil, 471.
Christ-party, in the Church of Corinth, noticed, 222-230.
Christian Church, its foundation in Palestine, 5-20; the first germ of its constitution, 20-38; the mixed character of the first converts, 21; its rites and ceremonies, 22-28, 156-166; ecclesiastical officers, 28-37, 145-154; their consecration, 156; election, 156; the outward condition of the primitive Church, 38-57; the division between the Jewish and Gentile Christians, 120-134; the ecclesiastical usages of the Gentile Christians, 134-166; Christians of one city formed a local Church, 153; Pauline idea of the Church, 447-451.
Christians, origin of the name, 105; the first names of, 105.
Christianity, its diffusion from the Church of Jerusalem among heathen nations, 58-379; by the instrumentality of Peter, 65-77, 372; by Paul, 78-320; John the Evangelist, 348-413; its gradual development, 230; purifies, but does not dissolve the social relations, 247; not merely a new law, but a new internal creation, 504.
Christology, Paul's, 460-469.
Chronology of the New Testament, 93, 103, 105, 120, 205, 261, 285, 310.
Church, the, Christ its historical basis, 5, 20; the disciples of Christ its first scaffolding, 6; the Pentecostal miracle its beginning, 5, 9; the first form and constitution of the community, 20-36; government of, 145-156; its discipline, 25, 26; severity of Paul's church discipline, 242; Paul's idea of the Church, 447-451; John's, 523.
Cilicia, Christianity in, 103, 168, 334.
Circumcision, 108, 120, 124, 163, 213, 216, 281.
Civil government, a divine ordinance, 267.
Claudius banishes the Jews from Rome, 192.
Clemens Romanus, the antiquity of his first Epistle, 229.
Clement, Bishop of Rome, on Paul's visit to the boundaries of the West, 307, 311; on the martyrdom of Peter, 349.
Clementines, legendary documents, 231, 264, 298.
Colossæ, the Church there founded by Epaphras, 170, 294; Philemon the overseer of it, 291; troubled with false teachers, 294; whom Paul opposed, 297; Paul's Epistle to this Church, conveyed by Tychicus, 302.
Coming, the second, of Christ. See *Parusia*.
Community of goods in the early Church, 25, 26.
Confirmation. See *Imposition of Hands*.
Consciousness of God, our, undeniableess of, according to Paul, 401, 402.
Consecration to church offices, how conducted, 156.
Corinth, the metropolis of Achaia, visited by Paul, 191; Church founded there by Paul, 191-201; Paul's second visit to, 240-242; celebrated as a seat of literature and philosophy, 192; divisions in the Church, 218-239; Paul's two epistles to this Church, 243-260; lost epistles to, 242, 251-253; letter from to Paul, 243; case of the incestuous person, 242, 252; Paul a third time in, 261-274.
Cornelius, the centurion, 69-77, 97.
Council, the Apostolic, 125-132; importance of its decision, 132.
Covenant, the old and the new, 8, 417, 454.
Crete, 315.
Cyprus, 65, 111, 168.
Cyrene, 65.
Cyrillus Lucaris, on the difference between Paul and James on justification, 323.
DAMASCUS, some time a Roman province, 84, 93.
Deaconesses, their functions, 155.
Deacons, their appointment, 31, 32; duties, 32-47, 145.
Death, connection of, with sin, according to Paul, 402; John's idea of, 509.
Decrees, the Divine, 399, 405, 474.
Demetrius at Ephesus, 254.
Demoniacal possession, 175.
Derbe, 119; Timothy not from, 168.
***Descensus ad inferos*, 344.**
Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, his statement respecting Peter's martyrdom, 190, 350.
Dionysius, the Areopagite, 190.
Diotrephes, his character, 376.
Docetism, the heresy of, 363; its refutation not the leading object of the Gospel of John, 369; but was of the first Epistle, 378.
Duumvirs, or magistrates, 175.
EASTER festival, whether observed by the first Christians, 159; certainly by John, 358.
Ebionitism, germs of, 22, 120, 124, 280; James no Ebionite, 327.
Elders, or presbyters, their appointment, 33.
Eleazer, 108, 120.
Election of Church officers, 156.
Epaphras, Paul's pupil, 170; and fellow-prisoner, 294; founder of the Church of Colossæ, 170, 294.
Epaphroditus, messenger of the Philippian Church, 305.
Ephesus described, 209; visited by Paul, 208; repentance of the Jewish exorcists, 209; popular tumult against Paul, 253; Paul's

- Epistle to the Church**, 302; a metropolitan Church, 305.
- Epicurean philosophers at Athens**, 183, 233; not opposers of the doctrine of the resurrection, 233.
- Episcopoi**. See *Bishops*.
- Erastus**, 259.
- Eschatology**, Paul's, 479-437; John's, 524-528.
- Essenes**, their distinctive tenets, 294.
- Essenic element at Colossæ**, 295.
- Ethiopia**, gospel carried to, by agency of Phillip, 64.
- Excommunication**, an act of the whole Church, 149.
- Exorcists at Ephesus converted**, 209.
- Faith**, the nature of, 419; as exemplified in Abraham, 419; the governing principle of the Christian life, 421, 427; its fruits (divine) love, 434; hope, 437; and knowledge, 438; the intimate connection between faith and works, 499, 500; overcomes the world, 520.
- Faith**, articles of, only one at the first, 21.
- Faith**, confession of, at baptism, 161, 162.
- Family**, relation of the, to the Church, 22.
- Famine in Palestine**, A. D. 44, 105.
- Felix**, procurator, 276; Paul's examination before him, 285.
- Females excluded as public teachers**, 149-154; on the veiling of females, 460.
- Festivals**, on their observance, 153, 358.
- Festus**, M. Porcius, 285, 286.
- Freedom**, Christian, misuse of, 232, 245, 267, 281, 301, 331, 432, 521; freedom of the will maintained by James, 507.
- Forged epistles not uncommon in the first century**, 199; for this reason Paul added his autograph, 199.
- GAIUS**, overseer of a Church, 376.
- Galatian churches**, 172; Paul's Epistle to them, 214-217; anti-Pauline tendency in these churches, 215.
- Gallio**, deputy of Achaia, frustrates the attempt of the Jews against Paul, 195.
- Gamaliel**, one of the Sanhedrim, 45, 46, 81, 83.
- Gentiles**, intimations of their conversion in Peter's Pentecostal speech, 19, 20; divine councils in reference to Gentiles and Jews, 475, 476.
- Glossolaly**, 11-18.
- Gnostics**, Judaizing, 295, 299.
- Goôtas**, a mystical sect, 53, 112, 209.
- Gospel**, contrasted with the law, 422.
- Government of the early Church was by the whole body**, 149.
- Grace**, Paul's doctrine of, explained, 474-478.
- HARDENING**, idea of the divine, 477.
- Heathenism**, a development of nature, 401; its partial fulfilment of the law, 402.
- Hebrews**, Epistle to, its authorship, 320, 333, 487; doctrinal character, 487-493; points of agreement and of difference between Paul and the author of the epistle, 495-495; allusions in it to the high-priesthood of Christ, 498.
- Hegesippus**, historian, 325-327.
- Hellenists**, the, 29; the first preachers of the Gospel among the Gentiles, 65, 104; Paul's dispute with, 97, 103.
- Hellenistic, the, and Palestinian Christians**, misunderstanding between, in the first churches, 31-33, 78.
- Hermas**, shepherd of, 264.
- Herod Agrippa**, governor of Judea, 106.
- Hierapolis**, 170.
- Holiness of God in Christ's work of atonement**, 413-416.
- Holiness**, relation of the idea of righteousness to, 415; distinction between holiness and justification ever to be kept in mind, 430.
- Hope**, faith, and love in Paul, 437; in John, 524.
- Humility**, 441; true and false, 442-444.
- IDOLATRY**, Paul on the origin of, 187, 470.
- Iconium**, 116, 163.
- Illyria**, 261.
- Imposition of hands**, on the newly baptized, 211; used at the consecration to any ecclesiastical office, 156.
- Indifferent**, nothing, 432.
- Infant baptism unknown in the early Church**, 162; first recognised in the third century, 162-165.
- Inner man**, Paul's use of the phrase, 395.
- Inspiration**, different kinds of, 14; erroneous distinction between *ritium concervationis* and *error doctrinae*, 342.
- Intermediate state of the soul between death and the resurrection**, 431-433.
- Irenæus on the gift of tongues**, 17; on Acts, 20, 275.
- Isauria**, 113.
- JAMES**, the son of Alphaeus, whether identical with the brother of the Lord, 322-324.
- James**, the brother of the Lord, his ministry, 96, 321-324; at the Apostolic Council, 121, 124; his speech, 126, 129; probable author of the epistle from the council, 130; "certain ones from James" at Antioch, 204; advises Paul to conciliate the Jewish Christians, 232; his character, 326; led the life of a Nazarene, 325; his martyrdom, 337; epistle of, 327-336; the doctrine inculcated in it, 493; compared with the Pauline view of justification, 499; the apparent differences between the two apostles, 502-507.
- James**, the son of Zebedee and brother of John, executed by Herod Agrippa, 106.
- Jason of Thessalonica** lodges Paul, 181.
- Jerusalem**, collection at Antioch for Church at, 106; Apostolic Council at, 120-131; Paul's great collection for the Church at, 250, 272.
- Jesus**, whether Paul saw, during his earthly life, 83, 84; memoirs of, used by Paul, 101-103.
- Jews**, originally distinguished from Gentiles, 401; the predominance of the sensuous element in their religious life, 404; the number of, converted to Christianity during the primitive age, 280.
- John**, the apostle, his parentage, 354; his character, 355, 356; wore the petalon, 356; Lesser Asia the scene of his labors, 357-360; his conflicts with Cerinthus, 362-364; whether he was banished to Patmos, 364; was he the writer of the Apocalypse? 365, 366; the general character of John's writings, 368; his Gospel, 368; first epistle, 371; its object, 373; second epistle, 375; third

epistle, 376; various traditions respecting John, 377; his doctrinal views, 508-531; compared with Paul's, 523.
 John the Baptist, Paul meets twelve of his disciples at Ephesus, 210.
 John, the presbyter, 368, 375.
 Joppa, 69, 73, 75.
 Jones, 322.
 Judaism, a preparative dispensation, 399, 456, 489; and heathenism, 401.
 Judas (Barsabas), 130, 131.
 Jude, the Epistle of, its authorship, 347.
 Judgment, the doctrine of the, in John, 525.
 Justification and sanctification, 430; justification by faith alone as taught by Paul, 180, 205, 417-421.

Kingdom of God, its idea and extent, 455-459; a threefold meaning to the phrase with Paul, 458; its opposition to the kingdom of evil, 469-472; the development of the kingdom of God till its final completion, 472-479.

Knowledge, relation of, to faith, hope, and love, 438.

Kyria, a Christian lady to whom John's second Epistle was addressed, 375.

LAODICEA, 170.

Law, over valuation of the external observance of, 36, 37; Stephen the first to oppose the perpetual validity of the Mosaic, 49; Paul's idea of law as related to faith, 381-385, 396-400, 421-427; according to James, 'Christianity is the "perfect law," 333, 334, 502, 505.

Logos, Paul's idea of the, 460-463; in the Epistle to the Hebrews, 494; John's idea of, 369, 514; Philo's conception, 462, 498.

Lord's Supper, its celebration in the first Church, 23; among the Gentile Christians, 165; Paul's view of, 453-455; John on, 529, 530.

Love, the fruit of faith, 434; greater than faith and hope, 440.

Lucian quoted, 112.

Luke, 2-4, 173, 177, 259.

Luther, (Paul and Augustine), 82; on the apostle James, 129, 130.

Lycaonia, 116.

Lydia, of Thyatira, 173.

Lystra, 116, 168.

MACEDONIA, 173, 250, 251-260, 314.

Maintenance of ministers the duty of the Church, 154, 178.

Marcion, his spurious gospel, 102; character, 410.

Mark, nephew of Barnabas, and taken by him to Antioch, 110, 132; the companion of Paul and Barnabas, 111, 132, 167; Peter's interpreter and companion, 12, 352.

Marriage and celibacy, different views respecting, at Corinth, 233; views of Paul, 246.

Mars' Hill, Paul's discourse at, 184-190.

Mary, the mother of Jesus, her sisters, 354.

Matthew's Gospel possessed by Bartholomew in India, 102.

Meats offered to idols, disputes respecting, 232, 245.

Mental with manual labor commended, 179.

Messiah, Samaritan idea of, 58; Cornelius' expectation of, 70.

Michael, archangel, oratories dedicated to him, 300.

Miletus, Paul convenes a meeting of the Ephesian episcopi at, 274, 309.

Miracles in the apostolic period, 39, 63, 118, 116, 176; their connection with Christianity, 116, 117; the apostles' consciousness of power to work miracles, 260; the power to work, a charism, 145; John on the miracles of Christ, 515, 516.

Missionaries, or evangelists, their employment, 151.

Monarchians, 264.

Mysticism, whether there was a tendency to, in the Christ-party at Corinth, 226; John the representative of Christian, 524.

NAZARITE VOW made by Paul, 202.

Nero's persecution of the Christians, 265, 311, 317, 345, 348, 353, 366.

Nicolaitanes, sensual heretics, 360.

Nicopolis, 317.

Noachian precepts, the, 126.

OFFERINGS to idols, controversies at Corinth on eating of, 230, 232; Paul thereon, 245; eating of, a mark of Gnosticism in the second century, 361.

Officers of the Church, 30-35, 147-156.

Ordination, 156.

PALINGENESIS of nature, 480.

Pamphylia, 113.

Paphos, 111, 112.

Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, on the Gospel of Mark, 352.

Parthia, 343.

Parusie, or final coming of Christ supposed to be near in the apostolic age, 27, 157, 196, 199, 246, (in 1 Peter) 347, 459.

Patmos, 365.

Paul, the apostle, his early life, 80; a skilful dialectician, 221; conversion, 85; goes into Arabia, 92; visits Jerusalem, 94; obtains a collection of our Lord's discourses, 101; returns to Tarsus and Cilicia, 103; his supposed second visit to Jerusalem, 107; accompanied by Barnabas, he visits Cyprus, 111; Antioch in Pisidia, 113; heals a cripple at Lystra, 116; Paul and Barnabas supposed to be Zeus and Hermes, 118; present at the Council at Jerusalem, 120; opposed to festive observances, 158; his second missionary journey, 167; separates from Barnabas, 167; his bodily sufferings, 171, 218; converts Lydia, 173; casts out a spirit of divination, 174; scourged at Philippi, 176; claims the privilege of a Roman citizen, 177; visits Thessalonica, 178; his untiring zeal, 179; visits Athens, 182; his discourse on Mars' Hill, 184-190; proceeds to Corinth, 191; cited before Gallio, 195; his first epistle to the Thessalonians, 196; his second epistle, 200; his controversy with Peter, 204; revisits Antioch, 202-207; proceeds to Ephesus, 208; his epistle to the Galatians, 213-217; controversy with Apollos, 220-222; second visit to Corinth, 240; sends two epistles to the Corinthians, 243-260; a spurious epistle of Paul's still retained by the Armenian

- Church, 242; his wish to visit Rome on his way to Spain, 249; tumult at Ephesus against Paul, 253; his journey to Macedonia, 257; vindicates his apostolic character, 260; proceeds to Achaia, 261; his last journey to Jerusalem, 272; at Miletus he convenes the Ephesian Episcopi, 274; proceeds to Caesarea Stratonis, 279; thence to Jerusalem, 279; interview with James, 281; undertakes a Nazarite's vow, 282; his conduct before Ananias, 283; imprisoned for two years by Felix, 285; brought before Agrippa, 286; arrival at Rome, 287; duration of his confinement there, 288; his relation to the Roman state, 290; his method of refuting error, 300; sends epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians, 302; opposes the Judaizing Gnostics, 295-299; released from his first imprisonment at Rome, 306; visits Crete, 315; second confinement at Rome, 317; martyrdom, 320; his character contrasted with James's, 321; his progressive knowledge, 484; not the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 333, 487; his views of justification compared with those of James, 499; pre-eminently the apostle of the Gentiles, 111, 112, 121.
- Pauline doctrine, 481; justification and works of the law, 382-385; meaning of the word *faith*, 385-387; human depravity, 387; the fall of man, 388; connection between death and sin, 391; revelation of God in creation, 392; the twofold principle in man, 393-395; the state of bondage, 395; the true use of the moral law, 399; hindrances and conditions of salvation in both Jews and heathens, 401-405; need of redemption of, 406-408; the work of redemption by Christ, 408-418; the idea of reconciliation, 412-418; the appropriation of salvation by faith, 419-421; the new life proceeding from faith, 421-434; the principles of the new life, Faith, Love, Hope, 434-440; special Christian virtues proceeding from these principles, 441-446; the Church, and the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, 447-455; the kingdom of God, its idea and extent, 455-459; the opposition of the kingdom of God to the kingdom of evil, 469-472; the development of the kingdom of God till its final completion, 472-477; the doctrine of the resurrection and the state of the soul after death, 479-484; the end of the mediatorial kingdom and the consummation of all things, 485-487.
- Pauline party at Corinth, 220.
- Pentecost, the origin of this feast, 8; the outpouring of the Holy Spirit during its celebration, 10-20; the Church begun at, 7.
- Perfection, Christian, 522.
- Petalum, or golden front-plate, worn by John, 356.
- Peter, the apostle, his parentage, 338; character, 339-341; call to the apostleship, 339; a married man, 343; discourse on the day of Pentecost, 18; his healing of the lame man and speech to the people, 39, 40; brought before the Sanhedrim, 42; visits the churches founded at Lydda, Joppa, and Caesarea Stratonis, 69; his vision at Joppa, 73; his interview with Cornelius, 75; his relation to Paul, 66, 67, 342; speech at the Apostolic Council, 125; his weakness at Corinth, 204; reprimanded by Paul, 205; his labors in propagating the Gospel, 342; his first Epistle, 343; on the canonicity of his second Epistle, 347; martyrdom, 348; on the tradition of his visit to Rome, 349; and of his wife's martyrdom, 353; pre-eminently the apostle of the circumcision, 343.
- Petrine party at Corinth, 219.
- Pharaoh a warning to the Jews, 477.
- Pharisees, at first not hostile to Christians, 38; their hostility awakened by Stephen, 49; the Pharisaic training of Paul, and its consequences, 79, 82, 98, 171, 221, 331, 382, 398.
- Philemon, overseer of the Church at Colossae, 291; epistle to, 293.
- Philip, the deacon, his preaching and miracles at Samaria, 60; introduces the Gospel into Ethiopia, 64; among the Gentiles, 65; his daughters, 150.
- Philippi, the Church there planted by Paul, 173-177; visited by Paul, 274.
- Philippian jailor, his conversion by Paul, 176.
- Philippians, Epistle to, written in prospect of martyrdom, 318.
- Philo, on the Logos, 59, 462; his mysticism, 296; relation to Epistle to the Hebrews, 490, 496-498.
- Phœbe, deaconess at Cenchreae, 261.
- Phrygia, land of the Magi, 297; Paul in, 113, 170, 207, 241.
- Pisidia, 113, 168.
- Polycarp, a traditional anecdote from, respecting the apostle John, 364.
- Polytheism, its character, 186; psychological origin of, 187.
- Praxeas, his doctrinal views, 264.
- Predestination, not prescience, with Paul, 478; his meaning, 474-478.
- Presbyters, or elders, their relation to the deacons, 32; probable origin of their office, 33, 34; identical with bishops, 147; relation to the "teachers," 151-155.
- Priesthood, the, of believers, 134, 135, 447.
- Prophets in the early Church, their gifts and offices, 35, 106, 138, 143.
- Proselytes of the Gate, 70, 112, 114, 124, 173, 195.
- Punishment, the idea of, 416.
- RECONCILIATION, Paul's doctrine of, 412-417; John's, 516, 517.
- Redemption, Paul's doctrine of, 408-418; John's, 414-418; the doctrine of, in Hebrews, 492-495.
- Restitution, final, of nature, 480.
- Resurrection, the doctrine of, rejected by the Pharisees, 38, 284; an offence to the Athenians, 189; opponents of the doctrine in the Corinthian Church, 237-238; opponents of the doctrine in 2d Tim, 319; the doctrine in Paul's Epistles, 479-481; in John, 524-526.
- Resurrection, the, of Christ, its importance to the apostles, 89; the transition point with James, 326; practical evidence of justification through him, 411; view of, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, 492; in the Gospel of John, 526.
- Righteousness, in the Old Testament sense, 205, 383; in Paul's sense, 383, 404; relation of, and justification, 417; necessary distinction

- tion between, and holiness, 430; the righteousness of Abraham, according to Paul and James, 500; the oneness of Paul's doctrine of, with John's, 523; the ancient idea of, corresponds to love among the Christian virtues, 446.
- Romans, Epistle to the, on the canonicity of the last two chapters, 261, 262; summary of its leading topics, 265-268; Chap. ix. expounded, 474, 475.
- Rome, Christians not banished thence with the Jews by Claudius, 192, 193; the Church of, its earliest members, 263; Paul's intention to visit them, 249, 261; the Pauline doctrine originally professed there, 265; Paul's Epistle to them, 265-271; practical difference among them, 267-271; Paul at Rome, 287-305; freed from his second imprisonment there, 306-316; second imprisonment at, and martyrdom, 317-320; tradition of Peter's martyrdom at, 348-355.
- SACRAMENTS, celebration of the, 160; Paul's doctrine of, 451-455; John's, 528-530.
- Sadduceeism described, 238.
- Sadducees, the first persecutors of the Church, 38, 45; opponents of doctrine of the resurrection at Corinth, 238.
- Salamis and Cyprus, 111.
- Salvation, 417.
- Samaria, introduction of the Gospel into, 58.
- Satan, according to Paul, 469-472; in Epistle to the Hebrews, 492; according to James, 507; to John, 510-511.
- Sergius Paulus, his conversion, 112.
- Shepherd of Hermas, 264.
- Sicarii, notorious assassins, 276.
- Silas, or Silvanus, Paul's fellow-laborer, 131, 168, 344, 352; the bearer of Peter's first Epistle, 346.
- Simon the Sorcerer, his character, 59-64; his disputation with Peter, 351.
- Simonianism, its pantheistic tendency, 24.
- Sin, Paul's doctrine of, 385-408; its inexplicability, 465, 469; James's view of, 507, 508; John's, 523.
- Slavery antagonistic to Christianity, 247.
- Soteriology. See *Redemption*.
- Soul, its state after death till the resurrection, 481-484.
- Spain, Paul's visit into, 250, 294, 307, 311, 312, 317.
- Spirit, soul and body, 394; relation of flesh and spirit in believers, 423.
- Spirit, the Holy, outpourings of, at Pentecost, 10; on the Samaritans, 62; on Cornelius and his, 76; on the disciples of John at Ephesus, 211; not magical, but according to law in its operation, 22, 47, 91, 150.
- Spirits, a world of, relation of kingdom of God to, 459.
- Stephanas and his family, 146, 156, 162.
- Stephen, the proto-martyr, 47-57; the forerunner of Paul, 50.
- Stoic philosophers at Athens, 183.
- Sufferings of Christ, doctrine of the, in Paul's writings, 408-410; in Epistle to the Hebrews, 494, 495; in John, 517, 518.
- Sunday, origin of its religious observance, 158, 159.
- Synagogue, how far it was a model for the first churches, 28-30, 32-34.
- Syria and Cilicia, 130, 131.
- TARSUS, 80, 103, 177.
- Teachers (*διδάσκαλοι*), their office, 35; maintained by the Church, 154.
- Tertullian, his testimony respecting Peter's manner of death, 348; on speaking with tongues, 17.
- Thessalonica, the Church there visited by Paul and Silas, 178; Paul sends Timothy to, 191; his painful report from, 196; Paul's first Epistle to this Church, 196; his second, 200.
- Theudas's sedition, 45.
- Timothy, Paul's fellow-laborer, 168, 169; at Philippi, 177, 182; at Corinth, 250, 251; at Rome, 308; his Mission to Macedonia and Achaia, 250; Paul's second Epistle to him, 306-310; on the canonicity of his first Epistle, 312-314; his release from confinement, 320.
- Titus, his circumcision opposed by Paul, 124; who chooses him as a fellow-laborer, 121; is the bearer of an Epistle from Paul to the Corinthians, 253, 259; left at Crete by Paul, 315; Epistle to him, 315-317.
- Tongues, supernatural gift of, on the feast of Pentecost, 11-18; at Corinth, 13; overestimated at Corinth, 237.
- Trichotomy of man, Paul's, 394.
- Trinity, the basis of the doctrine, worshipping the Father through the Son by the Holy Spirit, 530.
- Troas, 173, 257, 274, 309.
- Trophimus, 283, 309.
- Truth, John's fundamental idea of, 509.
- Truthfulness. See *Veracity*.
- Tychicus, a missionary assistant of Paul, and bearer of the Epistles to the Colossians and the Ephesians, 302.
- Tyrannus, the rhetorician, 209.
- VERACITY, as taught by Paul and James, 506.
- Virtues, the cardinal, 445, 446.
- Vision, the, of Stephen, 59; of Cornelius, 72; of Peter, 74; of Paul, at Damascus, 92; in the temple, 103; at Troas, 173; that mentioned in 2d Corinthians not identical with Paul's on the way to Damascus, 88.
- Vow, Paul's explained, 202, 282.
- WILL, freedom of, not denied by Paul, 477; specially taught by James, 507.
- Wisdom, 444, 445.
- Women not allowed to speak in public assemblies, 149, 154, 236.
- Work of Christ, the, 408-411.
- Wrath of God, the, 414.
- ZEUS, the tutelary deity of Lystra, 118.


3 2044 052 890 977

The borrower must return this item on or before the last date stamped below. If another user places a recall for this item, the borrower will be notified of the need for an earlier return.

Non-receipt of overdue notices does not exempt the borrower from overdue fines.

<p>Andover-Harvard Theological Library Cambridge, MA 02138 617-495-5788</p>
--

Please handle with care.
Thank you for helping to preserve
library collections at Harvard.

